

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

A NOTEWORTHY exposition of *The Doctrine of God* (Abingdon Press; \$3.50) has been published by Dr. ALBERT C. KNUDSON, Dean of Boston University School of Theology, and Professor of Systematic Theology. Dean KNUDSON's pen has been busy in the spheres of Biblical Theology and Religious Philosophy, but his books do not appear to be known on this side of the Atlantic. This new book will enhance his reputation in America, and is likely to extend his name and influence to Great Britain. No doubt it will have a mixed reception in America, where theological thought runs more to extremes than in Great Britain. But here it should meet with general commendation. For it strikes the notes at once of modernity and of conservatism which are so accordant with our theological tendency.

While the volume deals with the central doctrine of religion, it contains also an elaborate introductory section on the nature of theology in general and its place in modern thought. It is to be followed by another volume entitled 'The Doctrine of Redemption.' The whole will constitute a treatise on Systematic Theology which, if the promise of the first volume is fulfilled in the second, will be a welcome addition to theological literature and might well be adopted as a text-book in many of our Schools of Divinity. In making this last remark we have the following, along with other, considerations in view: Dean KNUDSON is a master of clear exposition; he is in touch with the most

recent developments of his subject; he is tolerant, sympathetic, and broadminded, yet pursues his own way steadily and consistently, refusing to turn aside from the main stream of Christian thought, whether with the Ritschlians or with the Barthians.

In the introductory chapters on the Province of Theology he defines theology as the systematic exposition and rational justification of the intellectual content of religion, and in support of this definition argues—first, that religion has a valid intellectual content; and, secondly, that this content in its Christian form admits, to a certain extent, of rational justification. The first position is maintained as over against illusionism (the various types of which are clearly distinguished), and the second as over against 'both an authoritarian and a romantic irrationalism.' Indeed, it is a leading position of the book that while theology is not to be identified with metaphysical philosophy, it needs—if it is to be adequate—a metaphysics that is theoretically as well as ethically grounded. But the type of theistic philosophy which it favours is not the traditional Platonic-Aristotelian; it is the personalistic, derived through Leibniz, Berkeley, Kant, and Lotze. Obviously Dean KNUDSON owes much in this connexion to the writings of Borden P. Bowne, an exponent of Personalistic Theism, from whom—as we may recall—the late Principal J. Iverach of Aberdeen used also to derive much intellectual and spiritual satisfaction.

Among the topics discussed in the Introduction are the relation of the Christian faith to reason or knowledge, its relation to mysticism, and its claim to be the absolute religion. Under the second of these the views are criticised of Barth and Brunner, who have sought to establish a still more radical distinction between faith and mysticism than that advocated by the Ritschlian school. Faith, they say, comes from God and forms no part of human experience. It cannot be translated into religious experience without being distorted. The religion of Schleiermacher and 'modern' piety in general are, like Catholicism, a hybrid mixture of Christianity and heathenism. Consequently the great need of our day is to establish the essential antithesis between faith and mystical, or any kind of religious experience. But Dean KNUDSON, while allowing that the Barthian theology has a considerable value as a reaction against a one-sided stress on the Divine immanence and against the easy-going humanism of our time, regards the attempt to establish this antithesis as a 'theological misadventure,' and as being a lapse into an 'obsolete supernaturalism.' For his reasons we must refer the reader to the book itself.

In treating, in the chief section of the book, of the Doctrine of God, Dean KNUDSON concentrates on the questions of the existence of God, His absoluteness, His personality, His goodness, and the Trinity. On all these questions he writes with vigour and clarity and in the terms of vital theology. With his discussion of the Doctrine of the Trinity he enters definitely into the sphere of Christian Theology, showing himself both critical and appreciative of the traditional dogma. Before concluding this note let us give a résumé of the points of strength and weakness which he finds in the Trinitarian teaching of the Church. He begins with the former.

- (1) Orthodox Trinitarianism has this primary advantage over all deistic forms of Monarchianism or Unitarianism; it gives us a *living* God, in the sense that His inner being is eternally active, and also in the sense that He is immanent in the world.
- (2) Another significant element in the traditional

doctrine is the provision it makes for the moral absoluteness of God. How can He be Love, if in His essential nature He is one and alone? (3) A third important religious value in the Trinity is the support it lends to the doctrine of the Incarnation, self-sacrifice in its sublimest form being carried up into the very heart of God. 'That God at infinite cost to Himself redeemed men is the most moving thought of Scripture; and it is this thought that lies at the basis of the Doctrine of the Trinity and is the inspiring source of all vital faith in it.' (4) A fourth element of strength in the Trinitarian doctrine is its philosophical value, as saving philosophy from the impasse to which it has been often brought by the assumption of an ultimate simple and distinctionless unity, and as protecting theism against deism on the one hand, and pantheism on the other.

So far the merits, and now the defects. (1) The most common objection is that the doctrine of the Trinity is tritheistic; and if each Person, or Hypostasis, is regarded as having self-consciousness and making self-decision, it is difficult to see how the objection can be completely met. (2) Another objection is that the ethical and religious values of the doctrine would be provided for by a Divine duality, and that there is no adequate reason for ascribing a distinct personality to the Holy Spirit. To this objection some weight must be allowed. (3) If we adopt the view that the word Person, like Hypostasis, denoted a mode of being midway between a person and an attribute, we lose the moral and religious values contained in the idea of a Divine society. (4) The doctrine of the Trinity was constructed against the background of Platonic realism, in which personality is subordinated to essence. But there is nothing more basal than personality, and essence is an abstraction from it. (5) The identification of the Divine element in Christ with the Logos on the one hand, and with the ego of Jesus on the other, is open to serious question from the standpoint of modern thought. What differentiated Jesus from all other men was, as Schleiermacher put it, 'the constant strength of His God-consciousness, which was a *veritable existence of God in Him*.' (6) One of the chief

reasons for the development of the doctrine of the Trinity was the belief that redemption was a mystical-metaphysical process which consisted in the communication of the Divine life to men, and which could be brought about by such a substantial union of the human and Divine in Christ as was provided for by the Trinitarian theory. But with the Reformation a new conception of redemption was introduced.

‘Considerations such as the foregoing have led the Church to be less insistent than it once was on the orthodox form of the Trinitarian creed.’ ‘The feeling . . . is that the doctrine in its older form is of permanent value, but that it in some respects transcends both the limits of reason and the demands of faith, and that it does not, consequently, have the finality once attributed to it.’ ‘So far as its underlying motives are concerned we affirm them as confidently as ever.’ ‘Yet . . . we are not convinced that the traditional Trinitarian theory has pointed out the only way in which the highest values in the Christian idea of God can be conserved.’ At this point the author would pass from Platonism to personalism.

The Proceedings of the Fifth International Congregational Council, held at Bournemouth, in July of this year, have been published under the title *The Living Church* (reviewed elsewhere). The meetings opened with an address by the Chairman, the Reverend J. D. JONES, which occupies the place of honour in the volume. The address was a notable one for both its subject and its substance. The main subject might be expressed as ‘a survey of religious conditions in our day,’ and there are some rather remarkable contentions in the survey, to which attention may well be directed.

Dr. JONES is not a pessimist. He thinks that things are very bad indeed religiously, but he deprecates any kind of defeatist temper or attitude. He quotes with approval Dean Church’s remark: ‘A faith which has come out alive from the darkness of the tenth century, the immeasurable

corruption of the fifteenth, the religious policy of the sixteenth, and the philosophy of the eighteenth, may face without shrinking even the more subtle perils of our own.’ Talk of dying churches and dying religion brings about the very defeat it fears. It is essentially atheistic. The New Testament note is very different. It holds up to us the picture of a world full of God, and of the knowledge of God.

All the same, let us face facts, and not hide our heads in the sand or comfort ourselves with vague optimism. Things are worse, much worse, than in the days of our fathers, or (if you are sixty or seventy years of age) in your own early days. Many people can recall the lean time of Huxley and Tyndall, the arrogance of materialistic science, the whoop of delight with which a well-known writer predicted the approaching demise of Christianity, and the aggressive and blatant atheistic campaigns of Bradlaugh and Mrs. Besant. Conditions were dark then, but Dr. JONES affirms that they are darker to-day.

The Church is largely neglected. Religion seems to be losing its hold over masses of men. And all this is symptomatic of a deeper evil, the widespread denial of the existence of God. ‘That is the tremendous battle in which we are engaged to-day—a fight for faith in the reality of God.’ All the conflicts of the past, Luther’s battle for freedom, the controversies about the Bible, even the fight that raged round the question of the Person of Christ—all these were affairs of outposts. To-day the attack is not upon the outworks, but upon the citadel itself.

Dr. JONES traces this fundamental scepticism to two large causes. One is the destructive criticism which has deprived the Bible of authority. To-day it is received as a book of wisdom, but not a wisdom that comes from God, not a wisdom that is the issue of revelation. The second cause is the new conception of the universe which science has given us—a universe so vast, so indifferent, so bound in chains of stern necessity. Many men, contemplating it, can see no room for a personal God.

And this teaching of scientists is backed by the contention of the 'New Psychology' that God is a projection of the human mind. These are the causes; and the scepticism of our time runs deep. The irreligion of our time is radical to a degree to which there is no counterpart.

But this is not the end of the matter. With the dissolving of the belief in God has come a challenge to the whole Christian ethic. Whatever may be said of men like Huxley and Tyndall and their religious beliefs, they at any rate were men of high ethical standards. And in their days even the agnostic accepted the Christian ethic. But that was illogical. Our day is more thorough. The whole Christian morality is challenged, and especially its conception of sexual morality. And it is well known that in actual practice this moral revolt has been widespread.

Nor is even this the total picture. Dr. JONES finds a serious defect in the Church itself to-day. It is that people widely lack a real religious experience. James Douglas wrote some time ago that what England needed for its salvation was 'to make room for God.' And that is what multitudes even of outwardly religious people have not done. People will believe in the reality of God when they see He is a reality to us. And the real apologetic for our time is not intellectual but religious, a deeper and fuller and riper religious experience. God is outside us even when we believe in Him. 'Our religion runs pretty thin.' Dr. JONES makes a stout defence of the religious standpoint on intellectual lines, but in the end he returns to the contention that we must get back to God, we religious people, and sink our roots deeper in Him, so that He becomes, not a negligible quantity, but the Living God, living in our life. This faith will conquer the world.

Is Dr. JONES right in his diagnosis? In spite of his protest against pessimism, his picture of conditions to-day is very dark. Is it true? In particular, is our state worse than thirty or forty years ago? A very good case can be made for exactly the opposite conclusion. Forty years ago

it was very difficult for a young man to believe in God. All that was authoritative in science seemed against him. He had to fight hard for his faith. Moreover, secularism was a powerful force among the working classes. Bradlaugh had great audiences for his atheistic lectures. There were shops in every town that sold atheistic literature of a peculiarly blasphemous sort openly. There was no religious movement in the universities.

To-day, it is infinitely easier for a youth to believe in God. Science is not irreligious. Philosophy is far more spiritual, and far more in sympathy with the religious point of view than it was forty or fifty years ago. There are practically no secularist shops to-day, and no secularist lecturers. There is a great and powerful religious movement among students. The most influential forces among boys and girls, such as the Boys' Brigade and the Girls' Guildry, the Scouts and Guides, are all religious. It is true that the passing of the old conception of Bible infallibility has caused some of our religious indifference. But we are beginning to reach a better conception of the authority of Scripture. It is hardly true, however, to say that the universe of Science to-day is bound in chains of necessity or is really a godless universe. In short, one might hazard the assertion that all the streams of influence to-day that count are making for positive religious belief.

It follows that the indifference and irreligion of our time are not due to fundamental scepticism, but rather to something else. Are they not due to the wave of practical materialism that has been passing over mankind? People do not deny God. They are indifferent to Him, because they are more deeply interested in other things, in comfort and pleasure. This is a far harder thing to reach than intellectual scepticism. It will be overcome by the working of the power of God in the life of man. The truth of God has triumphed over worse enemies in the past. Science was to kill it. And it survives. Criticism was to kill it. And it survives. To-day the real intellectual enemy is the newer psychology, but the truth will weather this newest attack as it has done the others.

Dr. JONES, of course, believes that also. And, if his diagnosis is open to doubt in some ways, at least his appeal for religious reality touches the true heart of the matter. God will become real to the world when the world sees Him in us who profess to believe in Him.

For religious thought the problem of personality is central. It is said that the idea of personality is being overworked; but, in fact, it is impossible that it can be overworked, for all problems lead up to it. Dr. STEPHENSON of Oundle, in the Fernley Lectures of 1930, has made very effective use of the category, and has shown in a most luminous way its bearing upon the central problems of theology and philosophy.

The title of his lectures as published is *Divine Providence in the Light of Personality* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). It is a work which manifests wide reading and clear thinking, and in it an attempt is very successfully made 'to bring the implications of personality, human and divine, to bear on the chief problems and aspects of the Providential Order.' The central thesis is that God is personal and deals with man as personal; whence it follows that the whole ordering of the world is governed by this relationship. Corresponding to the constructive activity of our own mind, which enables us to know the material world as a system of relations, there must be the constructive activity of another Mind, essentially akin to our own, which produces and maintains the system of relations that we know.

The influence of this dominant conception is to be traced everywhere. It becomes the master-key to unlock the ultimate meaning of the universe. Natural science, of course, takes no account of it, because the view of science is expressly limited so as to exclude ultimate problems. This, for practical purposes, is a most useful mode of procedure. Working within its own self-enclosed circle natural science has made wonderful progress. But as soon as we set out to discover the ultimate meaning of

things we are brought face to face with the problem of personality, and are ultimately led to the conclusion that this whole universe is fundamentally a realm of personal relations. Dr. STEPHENSON uses this idea in a thoroughgoing way, and shows its bearing upon such doctrines as the Being of God, the Trinity and the Incarnation, Creation and Evolution, Providence and Prayer, Pain and Moral Evil, Life and Immortality.

Take, for example, his treatment of the Miraculous. Christian theology accepts a personal God, Father and Creator, who has created the world for spiritual ends, and has put in it spiritual beings whom He guides and perfects. 'Are we now to say that God's guidance, as far as man's outer world is concerned, will be always and only quasi-personal, through the laws of matter, so that men's bodies are, from the point of view of Nature, things, and nothing more? Or can God, and does He, ever take any special action within the physical sphere for the succour of any particular persons? . . . The position I should support is, that as the divine guidance of persons is not quasi-personal, but fully personal, it will issue in particular aid and succour of individuals, chiefly within the limits of regular law, but may, and sometimes does, go far beyond this, in what, for science, is contra-vention of that law. . . . So it is wise to keep open the door, even in this world of marvellous orderliness, for the unprecedented which goes outside all ordinary rules.' There is a tendency to-day to introduce a sort of determinism into the Divine nature itself, as if for God Himself there could never be more than one way open. But, if freedom is anything real for finite persons, God must meet them, moment by moment, on the level of their freedom, and adjust His guidance to their needs. 'If we say, "given His character, His action is necessarily determined," we seem to be introducing into the realm of spirit that mechanical sort of interpretation which Streeter calls "mechanomorphism."' "

On general theistic grounds, with its fundamental belief in a personal God, the possibility of miracles is at least *suggested*. One difficulty in accepting the

miraculous is the utter impossibility of imagining the mode of its working, but this difficulty belongs to the whole set of questions about the relation of mind to matter. 'It does not seem that the problem of the contact of the divine mind with finite minds and with material things is, in principle, any different from that of the contact of finite minds with one another and with material things.' Miracle is not so much a breach of natural law as an event due to Divine action of another order from that which can be codified by science. Science, by a process of cyclic definition, forms a closed system which excludes all that concerns the spiritual problems of man. This works very well for the most part, but it will not carry all the facts in a world which has in it moral and spiritual factors, as well as physical ones. 'The desire to maintain a valid meaning and an open space for the miraculous, is by no means due to a narrow traditionalism which cannot discard effete points of view or make terms with new facts. It is rather a desire to be faithful to the implications of the creative evolutionary activity, which is marked by continuous increase in the range of control of mind over matter.'

So much for the possibility of the miraculous; now what about the actual occurrence of miracles as events in history? We find that opposite sides are taken by theists, some rejecting miracles outright, not because of any reduced conception of God, but by the expedient of bringing under the idea of Nature everything actual that has at any time been deemed to be miraculous. What tends to make the whole argument merely academic is that it never once takes up the implications of personality as fundamental to the whole problem. Science deals with the class, not the individual, but Providence and miracle, for theism, are essentially happenings of individual significance. The right procedure surely would be to consider the evidences of Divine guidance in regard to particular acts believed to have a private and personal significance in the first place, though they may well be evidential to others also. In regard to Biblical testimony to the miraculous there is an idea frequently expressed that the writers of the New

Testament had no conception of the uniformity of Nature, or of fixed laws as we know them. Anything might happen, and anything unusual was put down to a supernatural agent. This statement needs to be greatly qualified. To 'say that the men of our Lord's time had little or no idea of an ordered world is simply an error. The very word "cosmos," which we use so much, was used then, in essentially the same sense in which we use it to-day. . . . I believe that the men who had to do with Jesus were as competent to understand and record His words and works as we ourselves would be, if we were transported into that age. I do not think that a committee of the Society of Psychical Research would get any nearer to the truth than His disciples did. We have plenty intimations that on every hand, among the people generally, and also among His intimate friends, there was not the least disposition to believe anything and everything.'

All these considerations, however, are really preliminary to a study of the question of miracle where it should properly begin, and that is in connexion with the life of Jesus Christ. Let us repeat, it is fundamentally a question of personality. 'The higher the level of personality, the more likely are we to find evidences of control over the powers of nature.' So we should expect that this control will be most adequately manifested in connexion with the supreme human person known to history. In Him we see a compelling authority in every region of experience, and the gospel miracles fit into the picture perfectly. To deny the Nature miracles and to put down the healing of the sick to the power of suggestion is to distort the gospel testimony altogether. 'If there could be a perfect life we should expect to find in its history evidences of transcendent power over Nature.' The question may be asked, Is the emergence of such a person possible? But if the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation be accepted we have here miracle in its most impressive form. The supreme miracle of the Incarnation carries with it a series of included miracles. The Virgin Birth, the sinless life, the Resurrection, the mighty works recorded in the Gospels are, to say the least of it, congruous with

all the requirements of the situation. Looked at in this light the miracles are not, as is so often said, an encumbrance to the gospel. 'If we believe that they were an essential element of the self-manifestation of Christ to His own generation and people, they *are* evidence even now. If they had not taken place, He would not be what we believe Him to be.' And as for the dictum that miracles don't happen we must leave room in religious experience for the present activity of the Lord Christ Himself. 'He

is still personally interested in His servants here on earth, and, in answer to prayer, He may intervene. . . . So, generally, faith, for ordinary people, in ordinary circumstances, has its response well within the bounds of Nature's routine, and is constantly being justified by its results. But we must not exclude the possibility that in great crises, both for individuals and nations, faith may rise to exceptional demands, which receive exceptional answers.'

The Passage of the Red Sea.

BY HOWARD H. SCULLARD, M.A., PH.D., HACKNEY AND NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

THE object of this article is twofold. First, to illustrate the Israelites' passage of the Red Sea by citing an incident recorded in Roman history, which presents somewhat similar features—the capture of New Carthage by Scipio Africanus. Second, to try to give a concise statement of the various modern theories concerning the topography of the crossing of the Red Sea. For when the present writer was seeking to compare the New Carthage with the Red Sea episode, he was unable to find any such statement in English. I have discussed elsewhere (*Scipio Africanus in the Second Punic War*, Camb. Univ. Press, 1930) the difficulties arising out of the account of the capture of New Carthage given by the ancient historians. The conclusion to which one seems forced is that the miraculous sinking of the waters of the lagoon there, which enabled Scipio to storm the town, was due to the action of an unexpected wind arising at the critical moment, much in the same way as, according to the earliest account of the OT, the sudden wind enabled the Israelites to cross the Red Sea. Before the parallel can be drawn, however, it will be necessary to examine in some detail the various explanations put forward regarding the crossing of the Red Sea. For the simple explanation of the wind as the natural cause, which is given by the document J and accepted by most scholars, has not met with universal approval, and has been supplemented by the volcanic theory of H. Gressmann and his followers (e.g. recently by Dr. Oesterley in *Hebrew Religion*, and tentatively by G. Harford in *Peake's*

Commentary). Thus a preliminary step must be the brief examination of the various theories advanced regarding the geography of the Exodus—the equally vexed question of the chronology luckily can be left on one side. The scope of this article precludes any detailed examination of the evidence on which these theories rest, and it only aims at trying to give an orderly conspectus of the whole, in order to see to what conclusions we are led if certain premises are accepted. Then with the way cleared, it can be seen what bearing the New Carthage episode has on the crossing of the Red Sea.

The complexity of the geographical problems involved has made the question of the route of the Exodus a happy hunting-ground for scholars. For the evidence is susceptible of such varied interpretations that, so far from any general agreement having been reached, it seems to be a sphere where almost any theory can find some support and scarcely any theory can be with certainty rejected. Amid such disagreement the amateur rushes in where the OT scholar fears to tread, or at least walks warily. The present writer is only too conscious of the folly of rushing in, but hopes that his *ὑβρις* may be mitigated by the limitation of his scope—namely, the attempt to ascertain what is held, rather than the proposal of any fresh theory.

The site of the episode was the Red Sea, or more correctly the Sea of Reeds (Weeds), the *Yam Suph*. The Red Sea itself, in the modern geographical connotation, does not come into the question, but only

its northern extensions, either the western or eastern arm. These two main claimants for the honour of having overwhelmed the Egyptians and aided the escape of the Israelites must be considered separately. The term *Yam Suph* involves some difficulties. For if, as is conceivable, it is regarded merely as a proper name given to various places without bearing on their topography, then discussion fails. But the name is generally accepted as signifying literally a Sea of Reeds. Again, it may have been a general term applied to the northern part of the modern Red Sea, for it was used of both the western and eastern arms. This seems unlikely, for, as Gressmann points out (*Mose und seine Zeit*, p. 415), names in early times, like those of the modern Arabs, were applied only to very small geographical units. Thus *Yam Suph* was perhaps the name given to one or more places of limited extent, and, being more than a mere proper name, had some bearing on the nature of the spot. If this is so, where did it lie, and where did the Israelites cross it?

THE WESTERN SITES fall into three divisions: (1) the most southern one, near modern Suez, either just north or just south of the town (so Major Palmer, H. Ewald, G. Ebers, and E. Robinson). Now, if the Gulf of Suez had the same configuration and limits at the time of the Exodus as it has to-day, and if Mt. Sinai lay in the southern end of the Sinaitic Peninsula, then this site is probable.

(2) Some spot between Lake Timsah and the southern end of the Great Bitter Lake. Any position here rests on the hypothesis that the Gulf of Suez extended considerably farther northwards at the time of the Exodus than it does to-day, at least as far as the Bitter Lake, perhaps as far as Lake Timsah, with a short westerly extension along the Wady Tumilat towards Pithom. Undoubtedly in prehistoric times, before the Pleistocene Age, the Mediterranean was connected with the Gulf of Suez. But did part of this connexion exist in the time of Moses, and can the above hypothesis be accepted? The evidence cannot be examined in detail here, but there is much to support the view—modern geological evidence, the naming of Heroopolis (Pithom) by classical geographers as the starting-place of the Ἀράβιος κόλπος, i.e. the Red Sea (e.g. Strabo, xvi. 4. 2, 5, and Theophrastus, Pl. iv. 7. 2), and the fact that the account of the flight of Sinuhit and an inscription relating to Ptolemy the Second found at Pithom seem to show that Kem-uer (the Great Black Water) both included L. Timsah and was connected by water with the Red Sea (so Driver, *Exodus*, p. 127). But

there are serious objections—the evidence of Pliny (*N.H.* vi. 165), the fact that the north end of the Red Sea was placed at Klyasma, which was near Suez (unless, with Naville, we identify 'Klyasma' with the sea beach of L. Timsah), while the inscriptions set up by Darius along the canal which he dug show that this canal reached to Suez, i.e. in the 5th cent. B.C. the real beginning of the sea was at Suez. But perhaps this last point is a false deduction and the canal was only dug because the waterway was silting up: that is, as Kittel argues (*Gesch. des Volkes Isr.* i.⁶ p. 352), a water connexion between Pithom and Suez existed in Darius' day in the form of shallows which had to be connected with each other to secure navigability, or else the terrain was approaching its present state so that the connexion, unbroken in some places, was being silted up in others where a channel had to be dug. Kittel also suggests that the bay was called the Bay of Heroopolis, because this was the only town in the neighbourhood before the founding of Arsinoë; and that the reason of calling the arm of the sea by the name of a town some forty miles distant, was because the recollection lived on that the sea had once reached it. So, although the 5th cent. saw the ground approaching modern conditions, in the time of the Exodus the evolution had not progressed nearly so far and the Red Sea was probably connected with L. Timsah. Those who accept this hypothesis fall into two classes. The first (as R. S. Poole and Naville) suppose the Israelites to have crossed between L. Timsah and the Bitter Lake just north of the 'Serapeum.' The second school (e.g. Sir J. W. Dawson and A. H. McNeile) places the crossing at the south end of the Great Bitter Lake—as the 'East wind' fits in here better, the wind in this case being identified with the scorching S.E. Sirocco.

(3) Turning now to the third possible district in the west, we find Brugsch in 1875 propounding the view that the Serbonian Lake, near the shore of the Mediterranean, was the site. He identified Rameses with Zoan (Tanis), and placed Pithom in the N.E. corner of the Delta, between Tanis and Pelusium. With Naville's identification of Pithom (Heroopolis), with Tell-el-Mashkuta in the Wady Tumilat, this theory was abandoned, but it has been again revived by Dr. Gardiner and T. E. Peet. They identify Rameses with Pelusium, Pithom with Tell-el-Retabah (where Petrie places Rameses), and bring the Israelites along the road north of the Serbonian Lake (not along the military road to Syria—cf. Ex 13¹⁷, 'to avoid war with the Philistines'). Dr. Gardiner hesitates slightly (*Journal of Egyptian*

Archæology, x. 1924), and advances the claims of Tell-el-Retabah for Pithom 'very tentatively,' for he admits Wiener's objection that Retabah shows no sign of a Roman occupation and so can hardly be Heroopolis. However, on the strength of the identification of Pelusium with Rameses, the Serbonian Lake theory is upheld. And such are the three main districts suggested in the west, i.e. (1) near Suez, (2) near the Great Bitter Lake, (3) near the Serbonian Lake.

THE EASTERN ARM of the Red Sea, the Gulf of Akaba or Ælanitic Gulf, also has been suggested as the site. It, or part of it, was undoubtedly called *Yam Suph*, the Sea of Reeds, as in 1 K 9²⁶ (cf. Nu 21⁴ and Dt 21). Further, Jeremiah (49²¹) places *Yam Suph* in Edomite territory, and Judges (11¹⁶) refers to the journey of the Israelites from Egypt *through the wilderness* to the Sea of Reeds; i.e. the Sea is outside Egypt proper. If Gressmann's volcanic theory is correct (see below), then this site is possible. But Kittel (*op. cit.* p. 349, n. 3) maintains that the evidence of Exodus (10¹⁹ 15²² 13¹⁸) all points to the western site of *Yam Suph*.

Three further considerations contribute their quota to the problem:

- (1) The site of Sinai.
- (2) The intended destination of the Israelites.
- (3) The route followed by them from Egypt to Sinai.

First, the site of Sinai. Three main districts have claimed Sinai: (a) the Sinaitic Peninsula, so called from the traditional view that the holy mountain lay in it towards the south. This view only emerges about the 3rd or 4th cent. A.D., and even so the exact peak is not settled, whether Jebel Musa, J. Serbal, or elsewhere. (b) The district around Kadesh. There is much evidence to support the view that Sinai, together with Kadesh, Zin, Paran, and Rephidim are all to be associated with Edom, and that Sinai was near Kadesh, not in Arabia. (c) Arabia, east of the Gulf of Akaba, as Wellhausen and Meyer hold on the evidence of Seir and an Arabian Midian. A more modern view would identify Sinai with Petra (see the *Times*, 10/11/27; D. Nielsen, *Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 1927, vii. p. 187; and H. Hommel in *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni*, 1928, vi. pp. 19-27. Both late Jewish, e.g. Josephus, iv. 4, and modern Moslem traditions fix the site of the desert sojourn at the Wady Musa, in the centre of which lay Petra; so Dean Stanley was led to the identification of Petra with Kadesh-Barnea, a view now generally rejected). But the chief reason for placing Sinai in Arabia is the belief that it was

a volcano. If it was, it must have been situated here, not in the Sinaitic Peninsula, for the volcanic zone does not extend farther west than the Ælanitic Gulf. But was it a volcano? Gressmann answers 'Yes,' on the strength of such passages as Ex 19¹⁸, Dt 4^{11, 12}, Jg 5^{4, 5}, Ps 68^{7, 8}, etc. This hypothesis not only explains such passages as 'the mountain burned with fire,' 'the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace,' and 'the mountains quaked,' but it also gives a reasonable explanation of how the story of the pillar of cloud and of fire arose. The ordinary explanation of the fiery pillar, that it possibly derived from some practice like the carrying of a brazier at the head of a Persian or Greek army or Arab caravan, which was the outward source of a symbolic expression of faith in God as Protector, is rejected by Gressmann. He argues that so extraordinary a tradition could hardly originate from a common everyday practice, and that one sees the activity of God in natural rather than in artificial phenomena, e.g. in a spring of water rather than in a cistern. Leaving the question of the volcano on one side for the moment, the further point arises as to whether Sinai and Horeb were one and the same. And perhaps from the answer to this a possible solution to many of the difficulties suggests itself. If Sinai and Horeb are thought of as two mountains, Sinai near Kadesh, and Horeb east of Akaba, e.g. at J. Harb, this would remove the difficulty of Dt 1², which says that Horeb is eleven days from Kadesh. But perhaps Kittel's explanation is best, that the two mountains can scarcely have been the same originally, but that they were not very far apart and were identified very early. That is, the earliest source J may have located Sinai near Kadesh, while another early source E thought Horeb was in the south of the Sinaitic Peninsula; and E, by identifying the two, has transferred to the revelation at Horeb the known or transmitted view of a volcanic outburst. So the historical Sinai may have been near Kadesh in the desert S.W. of Edom, but the site was soon lost sight of in Israel, and the highest mountain in the Sinaitic Peninsula, Horeb, was put in its place. And although the description of the law-giving at Sinai seems to imply a volcanic outburst rather than merely a violent storm, the writer might have seen a volcano without having been to Arabia (for they exist here and there in Palestine) and have applied a description gleaned from personal experience to an event where there was actually no volcano active.

The second consideration is the intended destination of the Israelites. Their object was to escape

from Egypt, their excuse a three days' journey into the wilderness to sacrifice to Jahweh, but what was their destination? They ultimately reached Palestine, but it is unlikely that they started with any intention of going there, unless we accept the view that they went by way of the Serbonian Lake. Ex 13^{17, 18} (E) says that they went by way of the desert to avoid the Philistines, *i.e.* Palestine is implicitly the destination, for the Israelites did not take the nearer route, but another longer one by way of the Red Sea and the desert. The writer tries to explain why a longer route was taken by dragging in the Philistines, but his suggestion, made in all good faith through the influence of later ethnology, is negated by the fact that the Philistine invasion had not yet taken place. So probably the Israelites did not aim at Palestine. Sinai was a possible objective. For if Jahweh had already been adopted, Moses would seek to lead the people to the holy mount of their God and to the centre where he had been inspired. Or if Jahweh was not adopted until Sinai had been reached, Moses might have led them thither deliberately in hope of bringing them under the influence of Jahweh, the God of Jethro and the Kenites. Perhaps even more probable than Sinai is Kadesh. For the itinerary as given by the earliest source J leads direct there, and as probably only part of the Israelites had gone down into Egypt, what is more likely than that they would seek to rejoin the rest of the tribe, which was probably near Kadesh? A fourth alternative is, of course, that there was no fixed destination, but the Israelites simply aimed at continuing their nomadic life beyond the grasp of Pharaoh. The simplicity of such an explanation commends it, but perhaps their thoughts turned towards their kinsmen.

The third main consideration is the route actually taken from Egypt to Sinai. Here we are in even a still greater morass of doubt and uncertainty. The identification of the starting-place, Pithom and Rameses, is not surely established, as has been seen, while far less certainty attaches to the places mentioned later—Succoth, Etham, Pi-hahiroth, Migdol, Baal Zephon, Marah, and Elim. The identification of these sites generally depends on the writer's preconceived view of the route of the Exodus, for none of them can be fixed with certainty *per se*. For instance, on the Serbonian Lake route theory, Rameses becomes Pelusium; Pithom is equated with Tell-el-Retabah; Migdol with Magdolo of the Antonine Itinerary (Tell-el-Her) half-way between Pelusium and Thel; Marah and Elim lie between Egypt and Kadesh. Those who hold to

the traditional site of Sinai would identify Pithom-Succoth with Tell-el-Mashkuta; Etham with the north end of L. Timsah; Pi-hahiroth with Pikeret; Migdol with 'Serapeum'; and Marah and Elim with places on the west of the Sinaitic Peninsula. But turning to the sources which supply these names, we find that the oldest source, J, only gives the starting-place as Pithom and Rameses and implies a direct journey to Kadesh. Thus a careful distinction must be drawn between the route actually taken and the route which later writers thought had been taken. In fact, the detailed itinerary of Exodus and Numbers depends on the document P, compiled some 800 years after the event. Doubtless P, and possibly E, thought that the route led through the south of the Sinaitic Peninsula, but the earliest source, J, gives no ground for such a supposition, and other things being equal, the earliest source is more likely to record an historical fact, the later source an historical tradition. Indeed, many other considerations militate against a journey through the Peninsula—such a route would take the Israelites away from their kinsmen into an arid land which could hardly support large numbers, and which at least contained hostile Arab tribes, even if it was not virtually Egyptian territory with an Egyptian garrison (whether there were Egyptian troops at the mines of Wady Maghareh at the time of the Exodus depends on when this is dated). Further, Dr. Stanley Cook (*C.A.H.*, ii. p. 362) suggests that tribes from this district may have escaped into Palestine, and their tradition of a flight from this Egyptian dependency may have helped to develop the present narrative. Thus very tentatively we may come to a conclusion, suggested by many lines of thought, that leaving Egypt the Israelites crossed the Red Sea in the neighbourhood of the Great Bitter Lake or L. Timsah and made for Kadesh and Sinai, but that an early tradition, based on an identification of Sinai with Horeb, led to the view that they reached Kadesh *via* the south of the Sinaitic Peninsula.

Turning to the nature of the occurrence which saved the Israelites, Gressmann, as has been seen, believes that they reached the 'Red Sea' at the head of the Aelanitic Gulf and that here they were in a volcanic zone near Sinai. A volcanic eruption took place, accompanied by an earthquake, while the apparently impassable stretch of water in front of them was disturbed. For the bed of the sea was suddenly raised by volcanic action and the Hebrews crossed over on this new-made land. When the Egyptians in turn were crossing, the

ground suddenly gave way and the sea returned to overwhelm them. To support the feasibility of this theory, Gressmann advanced two parallels—the sudden receding of the sea at Pozzuoli in 1538, and with its return a volcanic outburst which raised a new mountain—Monte Nuovo. The second is the eruption of Mt. Pelé in Martinique in 1902, which also was accompanied by earthquake and had an extraordinary effect on the sea. A further example might have been adduced from ancient history—one which is equally well documented, and perhaps even more reliable than the testimony of Simone Porzio on whom we depend for the account of the outbreak at Pozzuoli (yet changes in the level of the land are common near Naples, for at Baiae, only a few miles from Pozzuoli, many of the ruins of the ancient town now extend some distance beneath the sea owing to the subsidence of the ground). Herodotus, viii. 129, records how, at the siege of Potidæa by Artabazus during the Persian War, after a three months' blockade there was an unusual ebb of the tide which lasted some time and enabled the Persian troops to reach the town through the shallow water. Unfortunately they were late starting, so that only two-thirds had got across when the sea returned and overwhelmed them. The Persians assigned the cause of the disaster to the profanation of the temple and image of Poseidon, but the real cause was, says Herodotus, a volcanic disturbance. This incident is accepted without hesitation by modern historians, e.g. J. A. R. Munro (*C.A.H.*, iv. p. 316), and by G. B. Grundy (*The Great Persian War*, p. 430), who merely comments that it was due to one of those volcanic disturbances for which the *Ægean* has ever been noted. Such an incident supports the possibility of Gressmann's theory, but the latter can only be accepted if the geography of the scene is moved far enough eastwards to reach the volcanic zone. This seems to be unnecessary. For the OT narrative explicitly supplies all the evidence needed to account for the natural phenomenon—namely, an east wind. There is no need to presuppose volcanic action in addition.

The analysis of the OT narrative into its component parts clearly demonstrates the growth of the story. One of the earliest documents, the Song of Triumph of Ex 15, although a composite work, undoubtedly embodies an ancient account. If it is conceded that vv.¹⁻¹⁰ are ancient, then we have an early description of a severe storm and its effect on shallow water—'with the breath of thy nostrils the waters were piled up' (cf. especially vv.⁸⁻¹⁰). Then comes the document J, where the

action is still Divine and the phenomenon still natural—the east wind sent by Jahweh. The next source, E, adds miraculous details, e.g. Moses' rod; while the last source, P, has changed the simple action of the east wind into the supernatural occurrence of the waters becoming a wall on the right hand and on the left. Thus a natural phenomenon is changed into a miracle, and the metaphorical expressions of the earlier accounts are taken too literally, while the real miracle is overlooked, namely, that this event, natural in itself, occurred at the critical moment.

We can now turn to the capture of New Carthage (Cartagena) by Scipio Africanus and see that a similar event took place there and that a somewhat similar process is discernible in the development of our sources. In 209 B.C. Scipio determined to storm the Carthaginian base in Spain, New Carthage. This town lay at the head of a bay and was situated on a peninsula joined to the mainland by an isthmus on the east, while to the north of the town was a lagoon. Scipio beleaguered the city, on the south side with his fleet, and on the eastern town walls with escalading parties. When the enemies' attention was thus engaged, an ebb took place in the lagoon, and Scipio sent through the now shallow waters a detachment which stormed the walls where they were unguarded; and thus the town fell. Such is the usual account of the incident, based on our earliest extant source, Polybius, but it presents serious difficulties which can hardly be discussed here (but see *Scipio Africanus*, pp. 70 ff.). The crux of the matter seems to be that the ebb was not an ordinary occurrence—indeed, Polybius is self-contradictory, for while he seems to imply that it was a daily tidal ebb, he says it occurred every evening. Eduard Meyer suggests that this is because Polybius has falsely generalized the time which was correct for the decisive day, but it is much more likely that he has made a false generalization concerning the regularity of the ebb. Further, Meyer considers that the ebb in Polybius' narrative is the rationalistic interpretation of a miraculous account. The logical conclusion of this theory would be to abolish the ebb as an historical fact altogether. Such a drastic cutting of the Gordian knot would solve many of the difficulties, but it is neither justifiable nor necessary. For in Livy's account a solution is to be found. Although Livy wrote some 150 years later than Polybius, his narrative here is based partly on an earlier Roman annalist, Coelius Antipater, who in turn made use of a Greek writer, Silenus, who was a contemporary of Scipio and Hannibal, and who lived with the

latter for many years. Thus Livy contains references to contemporary sources, and among such references is the statement that, when Scipio was besieging New Carthage, a strong northerly wind sprang up which drove the falling tide seawards. Such winds still to-day alter the level of the water in Cartagena harbour. Thus the most probable solution, which I have elaborated elsewhere, is that Scipio started the siege of the town and met with little success. Later in the day a strong gale sprang up which lowered the level of the water in the lagoon and enabled Scipio to send a wading party with ladders through the shallow waters and to scale the walls at a point where the enemy were not expecting an attack. Thus the fall of the town was due to Chance or to Divine Providence, according as the individual interpreter reads the meaning of history.

The growth of the Exodus narrative is easy to trace, for, as has been seen, the miraculous element grew thicker and thicker around the simple story of the east wind, as ivy twines round a tree. The account of the capture of New Carthage hardly developed in so straightforward a fashion. Perhaps it started in the hands of Silenus, by giving the wind as the cause. But around the romantic figure of Scipio there soon clustered a mass of legend, and men began to think that he had special relations with the gods and that they had intervened to save him. This popular and semi-miraculous view of the hero, which can be called the Scipionic Legend, perhaps first arose from his extraordinary success at New Carthage. Precisely how the legend treated Scipio's conduct at New Carthage we do not know in detail, for we have only hints to work on, but it is quite clear that it added myth and legend to a simple historical fact, much in the same way as the E and P documents did to the earlier OT narrative. Against this popular view Polybius the rationalist set his face and determined to give a rational account of New Carthage. In trying to emphasize his hero's calculation and forethought and to cut out all element of chance and miracle, he has unfortunately neglected the wind and so obscured the issue. And it is only in Livy's later account, which is based in the main on Polybius, that here and there another view peeps out. So whereas in the OT we are dealing with a natural and with a miraculous explanation, in the Roman sources we have to add a third explanation, that of a rationalist.

Thus perhaps the ebb of the waters in the lagoon of New Carthage during Scipio's attack on the town offers one of the closest parallels to the Red Sea

episode which history has to give. But such an incident is far from unique. Dr. Rendel Harris (*Dict. of the Bible*, i. 802) quotes two parallels—how the Russians in 1738 entered the Crimea, which was strongly fortified against them by the Turks, by a passage made for them by the wind through the shallow waters of the Putrid Sea; and how Major-General Tulloch saw the waters of Lake Menzaleh at the entrance to the Suez Canal recede for a distance of some seven miles. Naville (*Journ. of the Victoria Instit.* xxvi. p. 12) quotes how twice in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the waters of Lake Geneva were driven back by a strong wind. Indeed, such changes of level, known as 'seiches,' are still experienced there and have reached a height of six feet. Other parallels could be adduced from ancient history. One, which Josephus himself (ii. 16. 5) compared with the Red Sea episode, describes how Alexander was in Pamphylia and wished to get past the cliffs of Mount Climax, which came down to the sea. He learnt that it was only feasible to go by the beach when a north wind blew. When he got there the wind which had been blowing south and had made the passage impassable suddenly veered to the north, so that he got his men through. This sudden change of wind was naturally regarded as a sign of Divine favour. Similarly, the exceptional lowness of the waters of the Euphrates, when Cyrus wished to cross the river, was taken as a sign of the favour of Heaven.

To sum up, 'the fact of the passage of the Red Sea,' wrote Dr. Driver, 'can be questioned only by an extreme and baseless scepticism.' Some of the detail, even apart from the miraculous elements, may be doubtful; for instance, perhaps it was not Pharaoh and his whole army that was destroyed, but a frontier guard dispatched after the fleeing Israelites. The route taken is admittedly uncertain, the place of the crossing doubtful. But the fact that such an incident took place cannot be questioned. Indeed, even if no such incident were recorded, we should have to postulate some occurrence through which Jahweh manifested His power in a unique way to the Israelites, to account for the later sudden development in their religious thought. The actual site is perhaps important only in so far as it affects our view of the nature of the incident, whether the cause was wind or volcano. The miracle is not that any manifestation contrary to the known laws of Nature took place, but that a natural, although uncommon, phenomenon happened at the right time and *at the critical moment*. And the importance of this is not the place, but the extraordinary impression which it made on the

Hebrew people. While the parallel incident at New Carthage so impressed the Romans with the exceptional favour of Heaven shown to Scipio that the belief was born that he was semi-divine, the Hebrew people with far greater spiritual insight did not take their miraculous escape to be a proof of the divinity of Moses, but to be a direct manifestation of the power of God. A wind arising some two thousand years ago may have given birth to

the Scipionic Legend, but one which occurred about a thousand years earlier had the profoundest effect on the development of the thought and the religion of the Hebrews. For the deliverance from the bondage of the Egyptians remained for the Hebrew people not as an historical fact which grew more dim and remote as the years advanced, but as an everlasting and ever-present pledge of the power and protection of their God.

An Ungrasped Nettle.

BY THE REVEREND J. S. MACARTHUR, B.D., ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE, LLANDAFF.

'THE assured results of Old Testament criticism' is a phrase so commonly and so confidently used that, in spite of the innumerable divergent theories which scholars continue to produce, it may sound odd even to hint that in this particular field there are still any real nettles left for faith to grasp. The clergy of practically every branch of the Christian Church, with the exception of the Church of Rome, have been trained in the critical methods of interpreting Holy Scripture, and even the laity are no longer shocked to hear that the whole of the Pentateuch cannot be assigned to the authorship of Moses, and that the work of more than one hand is to be traced in the book which bears the name of Isaiah.

The general impression among thoughtful people, both clerical and lay, is that the value of the Old Testament as a whole is enhanced just because by the abandonment of theories of verbal inspiration it is no longer necessary to attempt the difficult task of regarding every part of it as possessed of equal worth and authority. The more accurate determination of the order in which the different parts of the Old Testament were written causes the fact of progressive revelation to stand out more clearly, and analogies drawn from evolutionary theories, both in biology and philosophy, contribute to the achievement of the same result, namely, a Christocentric view of the whole Bible, both Old and New Testaments. The late Dr. Marcus Dods, writing more than twenty-five years ago, put the matter in a nutshell when he said: 'Those books which form our Bible are all in direct connexion with God's historical revelation which culminated in Christ. It is this alone which gives to the Bible

its normative character and separates it from all other literature.'¹ That is the modern view, undoubtedly Christocentric, yet cannot it be said that in its own way the old-fashioned view was Christocentric too? The pre-critical age believed that 'God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken to us in his Son' (He 1st), and modern criticism would not be inclined to dispute this.

But there is a difference between the old Christocentricity and the new. The old way was to read into the New Testament, and especially into the Gospel narratives, an exact fulfilment of the detail of Old Testament prophecy. Accordingly, although theories of verbal inspiration currently held might attribute equal value to the whole of the Old Testament, yet in point of fact special importance was attributed to those passages of the Old Testament which seemed directly to prophesy the coming of Christ, and not unnaturally a Messianic interpretation was forced on many Old Testament texts that could ill stand it. St. Matthew's Gospel is full of such interpretations, e.g. his citation of Is 7¹⁴, 'Behold the virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Immanuel,' and his comment, 'which is, being interpreted, God with us,' as a prophecy of the Virgin Birth of our Lord (Mt 1²²). Here the exact meaning of the Old Testament text is disputed, but in the following chapter he reads into a passage from Hosea a meaning which is obviously other than that which was in the mind of the prophet, where (Mt 2¹⁵) he quotes Hos 11¹, 'out of

¹ *The Bible, its Origin and Nature*, 23.

Egypt did I call my Son,' as prophetic of the flight of the Holy Family into Egypt when Herod ordered the massacre of the innocents. What Hosea wrote was, 'When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt,' the reference plainly being to the Divine vocation of the infant race of Israel while it was still in captivity in Egypt.

The allegorizing tendencies of the Patristic writers went much farther. An extreme example is to be found in the treatment accorded by St. Ambrose to Ps 137^{8f.}

O daughter of Babylon, that art to be destroyed;
Happy shall he be, that rewardeth thee
As thou hast served us.
Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy
little ones
Against the rock.

The Patristic age, like our own, found difficulties in the imprecatory psalms, but it got over them in a different way. St. Ambrose's interpretation is as follows: 'Who are the little ones of Babylon? They are evil desires at their birth. . . . When desire is born, before evil habit has gained strength against thee, while it is still small . . . dash it. But be on your guard lest, when it is dashed, it die not. Dash it against the rock. And the rock was Christ.' Such exegetical ingenuities as this may raise a smile nowadays, but have we so far emancipated ourselves from the tradition underlying them that we can really afford to smile at them?

Broadly speaking, it would be true to say that, while the old-fashioned theology avoided some of the worst results that might be expected from a slavish adherence to belief in the verbal inerrancy of Holy Scripture, it did so by honestly attempting to read the Old Testament in the light of the fuller revelation of the New. But the connexion which it sought to establish between the two was thought out on mechanical lines, and the attempt to demonstrate this mechanical prophecy-fulfilment connexion led to such vagaries of exegesis as have just been indicated.

The modern method is to interpret the connexion rather on the lines of organic development. If the work of biologists and physiologists points to the conclusion that organic evolution is God's way of working in the world of Nature, then it is reasonable to look for the operation of the same method in the spiritual order as well. And if the bond connecting the Old Testament with the New is conceived as organic, that means that the unity of the Bible is even closer and more vital than it was on the older, more mechanistic conception, but

it also means that the connexion is harder to demonstrate. Less ingenuity, perhaps, but a greater patience and more hard thinking are required.

One or two examples will illustrate this point. There is the well-known verse from the story of the Fall where God addresses the serpent, and says, 'I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed: it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel' (Gn 3¹⁵). The traditional interpretation of this passage was that here we had a *Protevangelium*, an announcement of the Incarnation and the Atonement, and even a prophecy of the Virgin Birth. Such an interpretation at once strikes the imagination. Less immediately striking, but much more profound is the view according to which in the Fall story taken as a whole, 'through an intensely anthropomorphic medium we discern the features of the God of the prophets and the Old Testament; nay, in the analogy of human fatherhood which underlies the description, we can trace the lineaments of the God and Father of Jesus Christ. That is the real *Protevangelium* which lies in the passage: the fact that God tempers judgment with mercy, the faith that man, though he has forfeited innocence and happiness, is not cut off from fellowship with his Creator.'¹

Or again, take the story of Jonah, where the sojourn of the prophet in the belly of the whale and his deliverance therefrom is regarded as a striking prophetic type of our Lord's burial and resurrection (Mt 12⁴⁰). It takes more thought and patience to see the deeper message of the book, that the family of God extends beyond the bounds of any one race of mankind even if it be His chosen people, and that the love of God is wider than the measure of man's mind, wide enough to embrace the enemies of Israel. There is a vital connexion between the message of Jonah and the more fully developed New Testament conception of the fatherhood of God from whom every family in heaven and earth is named, and the Cross itself is the measure of God's love after which the prophet was groping.

In this second example we see the emergence of a difficulty which may fairly be described as a nettle which the theologians of the Church have not yet firmly grasped, namely, the suspicion which falls on critical methods of interpretation when it is found that they involve a markedly different treatment of the Old Testament from that which the New Testament writers accord to it. This difficulty

¹ Skinner, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Genesis*, 97.

is one which is seldom fully dealt with by scholars, because for them it has for the most part disappeared in the general readjustment of their views of Holy Scripture which they made at an early stage of their studies. But in the pulpit it is different. Preachers realize that they have in their congregations many traditionalists who, without subscribing to any belief in the verbal inerrancy of Holy Scripture, would yet be deeply shocked to learn that their instructors in the faith were definitely setting aside New Testament methods of Old Testament exegesis. Accordingly, while much of the new knowledge regarding the Old Testament is shared with the laity, on this one point a strict reserve, if not actual silence, is maintained.

This state of affairs is doubly unfortunate. On the one hand it makes for a divergence of view between clergy and laity which in its turn tends to foster the wrong kind of sacerdotalism. On the other hand, without complete frankness on this point it is impossible to appropriate the gain which accrues to faith through the realization of the more fundamental unity underlying the Old Testament and the New. And so the nettle goes on stinging.

But if it is unwise to ignore the difficulties of the position, it is no less unwise to exaggerate them. The nettle is, after all, a nettle and not a barbed wire entanglement. It should be observed, then, that the writers of the New Testament, whatever methods of Old Testament exegesis they used, do not claim infallibility and finality for them. The Holy Spirit which is to guide the Church into all truth may surely indicate to her truer ways of interpreting the Old Testament than were known in the first century.

And again, we may ask ourselves how far even the New Testament writers themselves felt that they were tied to those methods of Old Testament interpretation which seem to us to be so unscientific. Would it not have been very remarkable indeed if they had not used them? They were the traditional methods of the Rabbinic schools when the New Testament was in process of formation. The New Testament writers were using not only the language of their age, but also its thought idioms, as they were bound to do if they wanted to be understood. Sometimes, indeed, they seem to drop a hint that they are making a concession in following these traditional ways of interpretation. For example, St. Paul gives us an elaborate piece of Rabbinism in Gal 4²¹, where those that desire to enforce the provisions of the Jewish Law on the Church are compared with the children of the bondwoman

Hagar. Then he points out that Hagar is Mount Sinai, in Arabia, where the Law was given to Moses, equating Hagar with 'the Jerusalem that now is: for she is in bondage with her children,' and contrasting this with the Jerusalem which is from above and free. To our ears such reasoning sounds a little frigid, yet we could almost imagine St. Paul prefacing it with a remark which he made elsewhere, 'Are they Hebrews, so am I' (2 Co 11²²). He seems to be saying, 'Even by using your own weapons I can prove my case,' just as to-day a theologian accustomed to use more rational methods of interpreting Holy Scripture may use 'proof texts' in discussion with a disputant who can appreciate no other form of argument. By accepting the challenge to fight with the weapons which his opponent has chosen he does not admit that they are the only ones or even the best available.

So St. Paul had other and better weapons in his armoury, and, to vary the metaphor, the architecture of his sublimest arguments stands firm without its Rabbinic scaffolding. Very suggestive in this connexion are his words: 'For how many soever be the promises of God, in him [Christ] is the yea: wherefore also through him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us' (2 Co 1²⁰). It is impossible, when we consider some of St. Paul's other writings, e.g. the chapter of the Holy Spirit (Ro 8), not to feel that when he speaks of the promises of God he means something more than those passages of the Old Testament into which a Messianic interpretation might be read. The promises of God which find their yea in Christ and their Amen through Him are scattered throughout Holy Scripture, and just because of the fragmentary and variable character of their expression (cf. again He 1¹⁴.) something more than mere exegetical sleight of hand is requisite for their discernment.

It requires patience to trace in the Old Testament the evolution of the idea of God from the crude conception of the war-god of one particular nation, bound to come to the succour of his people for the sake of his own prestige, to that of the God whose righteousness the heavens declare, holy in all His works, demanding of His people that they shall be holy too. Patience is also required to follow the parallel development of the sense of sin from its earliest beginnings, when sin was regarded in an external way as the transgression of more or less arbitrary laws, through the more penetrating teaching of the post-exilic prophets and psalmists who saw the real sinfulness of sin and the impossibility of finding any remedy for it save in the redemptive love and mercy of God.

Again, the promise of eternal life is one which finds its Amen through Christ, and the first intimations of it are to be found in the pages of the Old Testament. Here the old-fashioned theology had its 'proof texts' not all of which retain their cogency when examined in the light of fuller knowledge. The task which lies to the hand of its successor is a harder one than the finding of 'proof texts,' but it is also more fruitful, namely, the demonstration of how the early conception of God as the giver of length of days ripened through the deepening sense of communion with Him to the realization that His love for His people was stronger than death itself. Here, too, there is a parallel development to be shown through the expectation of a revival of the life of the nation of which the most striking presentation is Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones (Ezk 37¹⁻¹⁴; cf. also Hos 6²), the hope of the resurrection of individuals till the author of the Isaiah apocalypse could write: 'He hath swallowed up death for ever; and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the reproach of his people shall he take away from off all the earth: for the Lord hath spoken it' (Is 25⁸). The vital connexion of this inspired vision of the conquest of death with the victory of Calvary was noted by St. Paul (1 Co 15⁵⁴), but it is impossible to grasp the full significance of the vision itself or of its connexion with the central theme of New Testament teaching unless some effort is made to set it in the wider context of Old Testament thought on this subject.

The critical position which has just been indicated in outline will not be new to any one who has studied theology, but while there are many preachers who, feeling the unsatisfactoriness of the traditional methods of exegesis, have abandoned them, there are not so many who have readjusted their teaching of the Old Testament in accordance with the view which they believe to be the true one. The result is that, when they preach from the Old Testament, they use it only as the Thirty-Nine Articles quoting from St. Jerome, say the Apocrypha should be used, 'for example of life and instruction of manners,' and their ministry of the word thereby becomes the less effectual. Owing to the lacuna in the presentation of Holy Scripture, the laity are puzzled and wonder why the Church continues to accord to the Old Testament the high place that she does. If challenged on the point, such preachers would generally reply that they exercised this reserve in their preaching in order to avoid stirring up controversy and hurting the feelings of the orthodox. They would, however, do well to ask

themselves whether the real reason for their action, or rather inaction, may not simply be that they have not thought out their own position fully enough, and that they shrink from the arduous task of restating that Church's age-long claim to be the heir to the promises of the old dispensation.

If, then, the Church, in order to substantiate her claim to the possession of the charisma of truth, is bound to use those methods of interpretation which she believes to be the truest, are the old methods, therefore, to be entirely abandoned? Dr. Darwell Stone, in his article on the Mystical Interpretation of the Old Testament in *A New Commentary on Holy Scripture*, while accepting the critical position, puts in a strong plea for this kind of interpretation. He shows that it was not the invention of the Fathers or even of the New Testament writers, though it was developed by the Fathers, and says:

'This interpretation is closely bound up with the permanent value of the Old Testament. If the Old Testament is to fulfil its purpose as "written for our admonition" (1 Co 10¹¹), something more than its merely literal and historical meaning is needed. Many difficulties about Holy Scripture have been in part due to an effect produced by retaining the theory of verbal inspiration which the fathers held, and rejecting the co-ordinate theory of mystical interpretation by which it was lightened.' He then adduces the authority of the New Testament, but mentions that the usual opinion of theologians has been that the mystical sense, however valuable it may be to illustrate or enforce truth otherwise known, cannot rightly be used to supply arguments for the proof of doctrine.

That is just about as far as one could go in defence of the mystical interpretation of the Old Testament. But if the theory of mystical interpretation is really co-ordinate with the theory of verbal inspiration—and Dr. Stone appears to make a very sound point here—is it then necessary once the theory of verbal inspiration has been abandoned to retain the theory of mystical interpretation which lightened it? And whether New Testament authority is conclusive in this matter we have seen reason to doubt.

Professor C. C. J. Webb, in his *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (p. 23 f.), deals with the same subject, and says:

'We should be merely pedantic in refusing to avail ourselves of interpretations even of passages which we do not doubt to have been intended for quite other purposes than spiritual edification . . . which the piety of ages that believed every part of

Scripture to be inspired may have found in them. Many such interpretations may have become, fanciful as they seem to us as interpretations of those passages, part of our spiritual inheritance. It would be as unreasonable to refuse to refer to these (without pretending that we think they give the original writer's meaning) as to refuse to draw inspiration from religious pictures and poems, the subjects of which we consider legendary. It is another matter *ourselves* to invent "mystical" interpretations, or to put up, as if they were representations of fact, representations of what we are assured are merely legends.

That may be very dangerous, playing fast and loose with our sense of truth. But it is otherwise with the interpretations devised of old by men who did it in good faith, *e.g.* New Testament

writers turning to good purpose mistaken interpretations of the Old Testament. "They shall look on him whom they pierced." "God reigneth from the tree." Such texts are surely sacred in the sense which has been given them by tradition, though it be not that of the original writers.'

Here, then, are two safeguards for the preacher. Do not use mystical interpretations to prove doctrine; and do not invent mystical interpretations. To carry out these recommendations only requires a certain amount of self-restraint, but it is not so easy to make effective reference to the traditional mystical interpretations 'without pretending that we think they give the original writer's meaning.' What is here necessary is a kind of spiritual tact regarding which it is impossible to lay down general rules.

Literature.

THE CHURCH OF TO-DAY.

A NEW volume of the series which bears the general title 'The Christian Religion, its Origin and Progress' (edited by Professor J. F. Bethune-Baker) has just been issued. We had occasion to review the first volume, which dealt with the Rise of the Christian Church, appreciatively. It gave a picture of the new society of Christians already in being, its beliefs, and its way of life, twenty or thirty years after it came into existence. The second volume (not yet published) is to show us how the new religion made its way in the old world, and how it expanded and extended up to the present. The third volume (and the last), which is under review, is on *The Church of To-day* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net). It is divided into three parts which deal in turn with the Church's faith, its worship, and its task.

The faith of the Church to-day is expounded by the Rev. P. Gardner-Smith, and on the whole very well expounded. He has two excellent chapters on the meaning and necessity of faith, and then takes up belief in God, in revelation, in Christ, in the Church, eternal life, and forgiveness. It is all very simple and untheological, and, if it seems to any reader somewhat inadequate, he will have to remember that the aim of the series is to provide guidance on these high matters for senior pupils

in the advanced departments of our schools. There is only one criticism that can fairly be made of this part of the book. Mr. Gardner-Smith shares with some of his colleagues a curious capacity to combine doctrinal soundness with what might not unjustly be called critical looseness. 'We cannot be sure,' he writes, 'when or where He (Jesus) was born, or of the precise manner in which His disciples became convinced of His Resurrection. That does not matter. It does matter that the creeds are broadly right in their account of His person. . . . The early Church expressed its belief in the super-human nature of Christ by declaring that He was miraculously born, raised from the dead, and exalted to the Father's throne in Heaven. We may feel that these historical statements are less certain in their literal and original sense than was once supposed. But we may still hold the essential truths which these statements were intended to express.' Many people who are not obscurantist will feel that such a position is very dubious indeed. If statements are not really true in the ordinary sense, how long can we go on maintaining the 'attitude' they imply and demand?

The section of the book on the Church's worship, by Professor Burkitt, is altogether delightful. The subject is dealt with historically, and, though most of it can hardly be said to deal with the Church of to-day, yet the method is justified because (as the

writer says) liturgical lore without a solid historical background is almost worthless. In any case it is a fascinating story we read, and when we come to the actual worship of to-day we move along with a guide who enables us to understand what it is all about.

The last section on the Church's Task is done by the Rev. Canon C. E. Raven, D.D. It handles such topics as the Church's Ideal at Home, the Church's work in Christianizing intellectual life, moral life, and social life, the Church and the present world situation, and the unity and reunion of the Church. As we might expect from Dr. Raven, these matters are dealt with in a fine spirit, with a constant sense of the bigness of big things and the littleness of little things, and with an intellectual force and competence that are always satisfying.

We have noted two errata. On p. 245 near the foot 'p. 118' should be 'p. 246,' and on p. 259 there is an unfinished sentence.

A large volume (published at the amazingly low price of 5s.) has been issued containing the Report of the Proceedings of the Fifth International Congregational Council held at Bournemouth in July 1st to 8th, 1930, the general subject being *The Living Church*. It is edited by Dr. Albert Peel, the editor of 'The Congregational Quarterly,' and published by the Congregational Union of England and Wales. We have referred elsewhere to the Moderator's opening address, and may briefly indicate the general nature of this 'Congregational Lambeth.' It was a council met to discuss the Congregational witness, always in view of the larger life of the universal Church. As a matter of fact, Congregationalism often faded out of sight, and we have the more vital subjects of the Church's relation to all sorts of problems discussed—the Church's protestant witness, its authority, its gospel, its life in worship, its unity, its missionary aims, and much else. These essays will be read by many beyond the Congregational Church with pleasure and profit. The discussion of authority in religion by Dr. Palmer and Dr. W. B. Selbie is one of the best contributions to this difficult subject we remember seeing anywhere. The debates seem to have been marked by unusual frankness. One of the chairmen, for example, told the delegates that they were all too old. He did not believe that ten of the fifty-six speakers were under fifty, and the programme was an old man's programme. The communion service that morning had been an old man's service! There is little sign of this, however, in the papers read or in the discussions, which are full of a sensitive vitality.

GOD IN CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND EXPERIENCE.

The Library of Constructive Theology is growing, slowly but surely, and is commanding a wide circle of readers. The work of apologetics or the treatise on dogmatic theology does not appear to quicken much interest in the mind of to-day, but interest is undoubtedly shown in any 'candid, courageous, and well-informed effort to think out anew, in the light of modern knowledge, the foundation affirmations of our common Christianity.' And this is the aim of the contributors to the series above-mentioned.

The foundation affirmations concerning God are particularly susceptible to the constructive effort. The marked advances of natural science, including psychology, in the last generation or two cannot but affect the restatements of Christian theology on the subjects of God's nature and His relation to the world. There is no theologian among us more alive to this than Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of King's College, London, and many have been eagerly looking forward to the appearance of his promised volume, in the Library of Constructive Theology, on what is usually regarded as the central doctrine of religion. The volume has now appeared—*God in Christian Thought and Experience* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net).

It so happens that in the earlier pages of this issue we have given prominence to another important book on the Doctrine of God, by Dean Knudson of Boston University School of Theology. That two able works on this theme, both of them constructive in tone and method, should fall to be noticed in the same issue, should give heart to all who in the midst of the intellectual and spiritual crisis of our time are patiently pursuing the age-long study and quest of theological truth.

At the outset, Dr. Matthews, dissociating himself in this from the Ritschlians, proposes to consider the Christian doctrine of God in relation not merely to the words and work of the historical Jesus, but to the whole development of the religious consciousness. It is to be noted that, in common with the other writers of the series, he appeals primarily to the experience of the religious consciousness, and on that basis would elaborate his theology. Accordingly, it is appropriate that he should set out with the description of religion offered by Schleiermacher, who was among the first to concentrate attention on religious experience, and to make it the foundation of the doctrinal system.

A rapid survey of the question of the nature of

man's experience of God (the Beyond who is both 'within' and 'akin'), followed by an equally rapid sketch of the development in history of the concept of God, brings Dr. Matthews to the consideration of the Christian experience of God, of which the New Testament is the fountain-head, but which is to be identified, not with the religious experience of Jesus, but with the Apostolic religious life, being built upon the affirmation that God the Creator is revealed as love through Jesus Christ.

Characteristic of the book is the consideration it gives to the place of the anthropomorphic principle in religion. The anthropomorphic tendency is described as the line of upward movement of the religious consciousness of the race. The experience of God shown in the life and words of Jesus is represented as in its nature a development of that higher type of anthropomorphism in which the need for a Sustainer of Values is satisfied. This type is carried further in the Pauline and Johannine interpretations of the significance of Christ. 'The doctrine of the Incarnation, or rather the religious attitude for which it stands, is the completion and crown of the anthropomorphic religion of the Prophets and the Messianic consciousness of Jesus.' 'But this anthropomorphism in the doctrine of God is rounded off and counterbalanced by Theomorphism in the doctrine of man.' It is not only that the Son of Man is the express image of the invisible God; it is also that God has made man in His own image.

Before proceeding to his constructive statement, for which he lays an ample—indeed more than ample—foundation, Dr. Matthews draws attention to certain defects in the traditional Christian theology in its dealing with the doctrine of God. The theological construction, as he maintains, has always been inadequate; it has never succeeded in doing justice to the data which it had to interpret. The philosophical concepts coalesce imperfectly with the religious content; they are unable to take up into themselves the heart of the Christian gospel. This holds of Reformation theology as well as of patristic and mediæval theology.

But when this has been said, Dr. Matthews is not yet ready to take up the task of construction. He must first emphasize the difference in the intellectual background between the present situation and that of the periods in which the theological tradition was upbuilt. Here he is on ground with which he has made himself very familiar, and for guidance over which many are already indebted to him. He points out very pertinently that when the theologian seeks in modern philosophy the

straw for his bricks, he is met with a noise as of the builders of Babel. The confusion is, however, somewhat relieved when we examine the tendencies of the conflicting streams of thought. There is a real convergence. Naturalist philosophies are finding in the universe the presence of a creative movement—perhaps of creative life; and Idealism is moving towards the conception of mind as activity rather than substance.

The constructive part proper occupies the second half of the work. In it Dr. Matthews ably defends his central thesis, namely, that there is no inherent incompatibility between the modern conception of the Universe and the Christian experience of God. We refer our readers more particularly to the discussion—on the basis of an 'activist' account of the self—of the nature of Divine personality, to the restatement of the doctrine of the Trinity, and to the exposition of the idea of Creation. But from the opening chapter on Transcendence to the closing chapter on Time and Providence the expositions all move on the high intellectual and spiritual plane to which Dr. Matthews has accustomed us. The Barthian reaction from the theology of experience will have to reckon, in this country at least, with such a work as this.

PAPINI ON AUGUSTINE.

There are three great interests in the life of Augustine, his conversion, his mother Monica, and the 'City of God,' and these are the themes on which the latest biography of the Church father concentrates—*Saint Augustine*, by Giovanni Papini, translated admirably by Mary Prichard Agnetti (Hodder & Stoughton; 12s. 6d. net). Signor Papini has already given us 'The Story of Christ,' a book which, betraying a naïve critical innocence, was yet so brilliantly written, with such passion and imagination, as to produce an overwhelming impression, and to merit the description of a really great life of Christ. Something of the same impetuous emotion appears in this book. 'I admire him (Augustine) with all the strength of my intellect, with the Church I venerate him as a saint, but more than this I love him with all the devotion of which my heart is capable. . . . In Augustine nothing is lacking; he is all things. He is the whole man, the universal man, the man without a gap.' Here, at last, is one qualification for writing his life, a reverence which began when Papini was still a boy, and has remained one of his prevailing obsessions.

The best thing in this book is the analysis of

Augustine's religious and moral experiences. As Papini represents it, it is not, as most writers make it, an orderly progression from one stage of enlightenment to a higher. It is a labyrinth, in which Augustine wandered, coming sometimes back to positions he had never quite abandoned. Apuleius, Mani, Cicero, Plotinus—each of the false stars shines out for a time, and is in turn obscured, but on the whole the tortured soul does go on and up nearer the light. It is interesting to realize that he was in Rome at the same time as Jerome without meeting that eccentric genius, who might have done much for him!

We can never tire of reading the story of Monica, one of the genuine saints of human history. It is a familiar story, but what is novel in this fresh telling is the element of hardness in her which, perhaps unintentionally, peeps out. It is probable that she was behind the unutterably cruel act of Augustine in dismissing, like a veritable Hagar, the woman who had lived with him for fourteen years and had borne him a son. All the circumstances of this episode are wholly discreditable. It takes something from the brightness of Augustine's halo, and even from the loveliness of Monica's piety and tenderness.

Augustine was a great controversialist. Part of his achievement was his victorious conflict with noted heretics, of whom the chief were Mani, Donatus, and Pelagius. Papini points out that these men represented positions which are always being maintained in the world. He gives as modern equivalents Madame Blavatsky (for Mani), Luther (for Donatus), and Rousseau (for Pelagius), and has a tilt at each on his own account. His account of Luther is particularly quaint. 'From the beginning (he writes) Luther's rebellion had urged motives and pretexts of a theological order, but the chief weapon of Protestant propaganda was, and still continues to be, in part at least, the accusation of treachery and corruption hurled against the Church of Rome.' It is amazing that even an impassioned Romanist has failed to grasp the central principle of Luther's, and the New Testament's, religious faith. There is very little, however, of this kind of matter in the book, and we have nothing but appreciation for the masterly exposition of Augustine's positive message in 'The City of God,' in which, as Gilson not untruly says, Augustine 'dared to attempt a synthesis of universal history.' This is a fascinating book. Papini had a dramatic story to tell, and it loses nothing of vividness in his hands. He has discharged his debt to Augustine, and now perhaps he will go on

and complete his own autobiography which was not less interesting than the narrative he offers us here, and which, unless we are mistaken, he left unfinished.

THE BAMPTON LECTURES.

It is asserted that serious psychological publications number over two thousand a year. Those that are not serious must be as the sand on the seashore. The air is full of psychological jargon. Novels exploit it. Freud is a household word. Complexes are as common as measles. In these circumstances, to add another book on psychology would seem to be piling Pelion on Ossa. But, as a fact, there is always need, and indeed urgent need, for a real book on the relations of psychology and religion. And the new Bampton lecturer was happily inspired when he selected this subject for the 1930 Lectures and called them *Psychology and God*. The lecturer is the Rev. L. W. Grensted, B.D., Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion at Oxford University, and the publishers are Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co. (10s. 6d. net). The sub-title of the book is 'A Study of the Implications of Recent Psychology for Religious Belief and Practice.'

Professor Grensted is well aware of the vital character of the issues with which he deals. The 'New Psychology' he rightly regards as *the* enemy of religious faith in our generation, largely because of the insidious and plausible nature of its analysis. Religious belief is dissolved either as a projection of our own comfortable illusion or as the result of suggestion. In his riposte the author does not seem to us to make enough of the obvious *tu quoque* to which the new psychologist exposes himself. If our religious beliefs are purely subjective, the same analysis that leads to such a conclusion dissolves belief in any objectivity whatever. The experience of the religious soul has the same right of way as any other experience. It is *semper et ubique* the same essentially. This contention is doubtless implied in much of the argument in these chapters, but it is not given a sufficiently definite form.

The author takes his stand on certain basic facts—freedom, the experience of worth or value, and above all else the experience of otherness. We are continually aware, so far as we are aware of ourselves at all, of a relationship with that which is not ourselves. This is fundamental to the whole life-process. The ego is never pure, self-contained, self-conditioned. It cannot be ob-

served in isolation from that to which it is related. It looks beyond itself to *persons*, and things have only meaning (perhaps only existence) as the vehicles of such personal relationships. And this inevitably leads up to the hypothesis of a personal God. That, as we understand it, is the gist of the author's defence of the religious position. He follows it out in dealing with faith and worship, spiritual healing, sin and group-psychology and the Church. The concluding chapters clinch his argument as he handles the vital subjects of 'Objectivity in Religion' and 'The Claim of Christian Theism.'

There is much that is masterly in these lectures, a candour and restraint that leave the impression not only of sincerity but of well-founded confidence. Perhaps the last word is not said here, and we have read books that were more convincing, or perhaps more persuasive. But this is a sound and helpful contribution to a large and vital subject, and is worthy of its place in the succession to which it belongs.

SAMUEL TAYLOR COLERIDGE.

As a thinker Coleridge has scarcely received his due. No doubt the 'Aids to Reflection' has been widely read and often cited, but we have heard such quotations referred to 'Coleridge the poet.' That he was a poet is doubtless one reason for the persistent failure to take him seriously as a philosopher; for it is a widespread conviction that poets and philosophers are two distinct species. Again, Coleridge was a theologian and, it was assumed, was writing with a predominantly apologetic aim, if not a dogmatic bias. Lastly, he wrote a great deal in popular style, and there was another common belief that a writer who made himself intelligible to 'auld wives and wabsters' could not be a profound thinker.

Recently a truer evaluation has been made, and Coleridge is coming into his own. Miss Snyder deserves the highest praise for her painstaking study; and now we have before us a work which, we venture to claim, will be the standard book on Coleridge for a long time. It appears in 'The Library of Philosophy' under the title *Coleridge as Philosopher* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net), and is from the able pen of Professor John H. Muirhead, M.A., LL.D., whose name is a guarantee of accurate scholarship, clear exposition and just criticism. Professor Muirhead has made careful and intensive study of Coleridge manuscripts not easily accessible. After tracing Coleridge's philosophical develop-

ment, he expounds his Logic, Metaphysics, Philosophy of Nature, Moral Philosophy, Political Philosophy, Theory of Fine Art, and Philosophy of Religion. Thus merely to catalogue the topics reveals the wide extent of Coleridge's interests.

We can do no more here, and no better, than heartily recommend this masterly and informative volume which makes it clear that Coleridge was a great thinker—one of our greatest—in many respects ahead of his time, who in all future histories of British philosophy must be given a far more prominent place than it has been usual to allow him.

BETH-PELET.

Sir Flinders Petrie has conferred a fresh boon on Egyptian archaeology in his new volume *Beth-pelet I* (British School of Archaeology in Egypt, University College, London, or Bernard Quaritch, London; 50s. net), recording the results of the earlier excavations (1928 and 1929) undertaken at this promising new field, now known as Tell Fara ('Fara' = *palet*, meaning 'escape' or 'deliverance'), on the frontier between Judah and Egypt. The Tell, which is on the west side of the Wady Ghuzzeh, is a hundred feet high, and has nearly fifty feet of ancient ruined towns on the top of it, going back through more than two thousand years, from the time of Vespasian to the Neolithic Age. This first volume contains all the results from the cemeteries and from a large part of the excavated area. Other parts not yet finished are left for future publication. The results achieved so far throw considerable light on the dark years of the Hyksos rule, which have long been the period most needing explanation in Egyptian history. The town was a fortress of these Shepherd Kings, as is evident from the long sloping earthen rampart (instead of a wall) which guarded it, and which is similar to those at Yehudiyeh and Heliopolis. The results prove, for one thing, according to Sir Flinders Petrie, that the Hyksos Dynasties xv. and xvi. (beginning 2375 B.C. and ending 1587 B.C.) were contemporary with the Egyptian xiii., xiv., and xvii. This restores the chronology accepted about thirty years ago and places the date of the Great Pyramid about 3750 B.C. For another thing, they show that the Hyksos were not a whole population but only a ruling caste, like the Turks. Their pottery unearthed on this site is purely Palestinian, as it is purely Egyptian in Egypt. They seem to have had no distinctive pottery of their own, but followed the styles of the country

in which they happened to be. Apart from the valuable information regarding the Hyksos, the volume details and describes the numerous finds (pottery, scarabs, necklaces, earrings, daggers, figurines, etc.), and has much to say as to the Philistines and the operations of Shishak, whom Sir Flinders, in 'Antiquity' (September 1930) has characterized as 'the greatest builder known in Palestine.' The volume, with its seventy-one beautiful plates, will help in many ways in the interpretation of the Old Testament.

PALESTINIAN POTTERY.

For the proper understanding of Palestinian History, a knowledge of the pottery is essential. In this connexion students have long felt the want of an authoritative compendium of dated forms. This has now been supplied by the Reverend J. Garrow Duncan, B.D., in his *Corpus of Dated Palestinian Pottery* (British School of Archaeology in Egypt, University College, London, or Bernard Quaritch, London; 30s. net). Mr. Duncan has given us a valuable book of reference, a kind of index by which all similar forms of pottery can be registered and collated. It includes the pottery of Gerar and Beth-pelet dated and arranged by Sir Flinders Petrie, and the beads of the latter place dated and arranged by J. L. Starkey. From a study of these Palestinian expressions of art—as seen here in over one hundred plates—the Biblical student will not fail to glean something of the artistic sense of the inhabitants, their mechanical perception, their adaptability, and their response to surrounding civilizations. There is an excellent introduction of seventeen pages dealing with classification, notation, and dating, and giving the characteristic features of Palestinian pottery from the Neolithic period down to Hebrew times. A study of these features shows that, while much advance has been made in recent years towards a chronological scheme by means of pottery, no precise dating can yet be attained in regard to the common types of the Bronze Age, which are the most important of all for the study of pre-Israelite history. Mr. Duncan has made use of the Egyptian dynasties in dating many specimens, on the ground that ultimate definite dating in Palestine is only possible by reference to, and comparison with, Egyptian dating. But this process is not free from liability to error, for objects imported might not be 'deposited' till long after they were made, and there might be resemblances which have no chronological relationship. He has, however, given us far more

definite dating material than we have hitherto had and removed a large amount of the uncertainty. He has corrected the underdating at Tell el-Hesi, Jericho, and other places, and has not accepted the excavator's dating of his specimens where this is obviously erroneous. Fortunately, Petrie, in his discoveries at Gerar and Beth-pelet, has supplied us with materials carefully dated by their strata and attendant circumstances, and from these Mr. Duncan has been able to date the materials found on many other sites with definiteness and practical certainty to within a century at least. Apart from dating of specimens, the *Corpus* corroborates the view that from the very outset the Hebrews were only imitators of outside art and showed practically no originality or power of invention in ceramics. The Canaanite types and methods of the Third Bronze Age (1600-1200 B.C.) continued during the period of the Conquest and of the Judges. It was only in the Middle Iron Age (from the time of David and Solomon) that the Hebrews developed a class of pottery which might be called distinctively their own. The thanks of excavators and Biblical scholars are due to Mr. Duncan for providing them with such an invaluable collection of dating materials and such useful information for their guidance.

MONADOLGY.

Students of contemporary philosophy have learned to look with eager interest at any work of Dr. Herbert Wildon Carr. They know him as a reliable expounder of Bergson, Gentile, and Croce. They recognize him too, as an independent and weighty contributor to philosophy in such books as 'A Theory of Monads,' 'The Scientific Approach to Reality,' and others. They will turn with interest to his latest work, *Cogitans Cogitata* (Favil Press; 6s. net).

He has written it primarily for his own sake to give consistency to his thinking and unity to his thought. We could wish that this example might be widely followed. For a doubt sometimes assails us as to whether the views of philosophical writers can possibly be clear and consistent in their own minds.

This work is not bulky. It consists of an invaluable Preface, ninety propositions and a Postscript. Dr. Carr's philosophy is a Monadism which differs from that of Leibniz in that, illumined by the most recent science, it replaces an artificial 'pre-established harmony' by a harmony which is 'the natural outcome of the creative impulsion itself.'

In these days of Pragmatisms and Realisms which set aside not only the old solutions of problems of knowledge and being but the problems themselves, it is refreshing to find a thinker who insists that the problems are very real, and faces them.

THE EARLY MINISTRY.

In explaining the rise of the threefold Ministry in *Divers Orders of Ministers* (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net), the Reverend W. Lockton, B.D., adopts so far the familiar and probable view that the three Orders are first clear in Ephesus, whose pattern was very soon almost universally copied. The interest of his book is that he advances an original and interesting theory that there was a threefold Ministry of rather a different kind before that, indeed from the very beginning. It was copied from Judaism. There we find a twofold Ministry which had really become threefold because the Officials of the Metropolis were superior to the corresponding Officials of the smaller communities. So, Mr. Lockton will have it, was it in the Church. Every Christian community had Elders and Deacons; but the Deacons of what he terms the 'metropolitan' churches ranked in dignity and privilege with the Elders of the subordinate churches, while the 'metropolitan' Elders were really in Episcopal Orders, superiors to the ordinary Elders and exercising a peripatetic supervision over them. So the primitive twofold Ministry was in effect a threefold one. It is an ingenious theory which, we think, merits careful consideration.

The author has read widely; and whether we agree with his main contention or not, his book has great value, were it only for the collocation of relevant passages from early writers. But why has Mr. Lockton committed the unpardonable sin of publishing a work of this kind without an index?

THE MEDIÆVAL CHURCH.

The Middle Ages are no longer lightly dismissed in Histories as a barren period of wild unsettlement in civil affairs and deepening corruption in the Church. We suffer now rather from the other extreme. It is realized that they were so spacious and so fruitful that it is difficult to compress or give coherence to the tale of their many-sided interest and importance. The student and the general reader may be commended to a new, interesting, and impressive book—*From Justinian to Luther*—by Dr. Leighton Pullan (Clarendon

Press; 12s. 6d. net). The distinguished author exhibits the essentials of the developments of a thousand years, so that we cannot mistake the really decisive things.

The Rev. R. F. Wright, M.A., LL.B., in *Medieval Internationalism* (Williams & Norgate; 7s. 6d. net) also deals with the Middle Ages, but with a different aim. He sets forth and evaluates the civilizing activities of the Church which for centuries was the main, if not the sole, bond which made a European culture and progress possible. In particular he emphasizes the work of the Church for peace and the development of an international Law. He closes with a call to the Church of to-day to go forward unitedly to the task of making the Kingdom of God more of a reality upon the earth. It is an interesting and stimulating book. The statement on page 107—'From the time of Constantine, when the Church was first "established," this ecclesiastical body became a possessor of wealth'—is erroneous in two particulars; Constantine did not 'establish' the Church, and she possessed very considerable wealth long before his time.

The venerable Eduard Bernstein has long enjoyed widespread esteem as an eminently sane, though sometimes disturbingly independent thinker in the Socialist movement in Germany. For many years he lived in England and was a diligent student of our economic and social history. Some of the fruits of his study were published a few years ago, with the title *Socialismus und Demokratie in der grossen englischen Revolution*. This has been translated by Mr. H. J. Stenning, and appears as *Cromwell and Communism* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). We think the eccentric title is a mistake; but otherwise the translation is competently done. The Commonwealth period was seething with all sorts of social theories and witnessed several curious practical experiments in ideal States. Bernstein's study of them repays close attention and reminds us of an almost forgotten chapter of our history—a chapter which to-day is possessed of far more than a merely historical interest.

We have received the second edition of Dr. W. Gray Dixon's *The Romance of the Catholic Presbyterian Church*, published by the Board of Religious Education of the Presbyterian Church of Australia. The author had passed hence ere he saw it through the press. The book is designed

to inform the minds and thirl the loyalty of young Presbyterians to their Church, and it is fitted to do both. It takes a wide survey, perhaps a little too wide, and tells a thrilling story of the Reformation and the Reformed Church in many lands. Here and there are a few statements we should modify, but on the whole the book is worthy of warm praise.

A life of St. Paul for preachers, teachers, and students in India is something of a novelty. But, like the 'College' St. Mark, which was written for a similar constituency, it is a sterling piece of work. *Paul, Herald and Witness* is the title, the author, the Rev. A. C. Clayton, and the publisher the Christian Literature Society for India (price $1\frac{1}{2}$ rupees, say 2s. 3d.). Mr. Clayton has based himself on good authorities and has made good use of them. He allows his imagination some scope in reconstituting the scenes, but always on the lines of probable tradition. The letters are placed in their proper environment and sufficiently expounded. And the narrative reads easily. In short, this is a good enough life of the Apostle for any land, and might well be used in schools and colleges at home.

If any man deserves well of the Indian Church it is Canon Sell. In his ninety-second year he has followed up his series of Commentaries on the Old Testament, written primarily for Indian pastors, by a book on *Inspiration* (Church Missionary Society; 1s. 3d.). The standpoint is thoroughly modern. Dr. Sell is not afraid to say that 'some authors, like the Chronicler, idealised the history,' that 'there is no claim for inerrancy in dates, nor are the results of modern science anticipated,' that 'to conceive of Scriptural prophecies as anticipated history is an inadequate conception,' that our Lord passes by the miraculous acts attributed to Elijah and Elisha and 'emphasises their acts of human tenderness and love,' and that, as there are some inaccurate statements in Scripture, to speak of the inerrancy and the literal infallibility of the record is unwise. As the book may later appear in an Arabic translation, Dr. Sell deals with the Muslim view of Inspiration and is careful to point out that there are variants in the text of the Qur'an. The Canon has the knack of sketching a great subject in bold outlines and of presenting his case in popular language, and his book is well fitted to guide those who may be perplexed by the disputes between the Fundamentalists and the Modernists.

Two kinds of house are important for literature—the house with a mystery, that fail-me-never of the novelist, and the house with a history, which appeals with unending interest not only to the writer and the reader of fiction, but to a far wider and more serious circle. Few houses still inhabited have had such a history as Lambeth Palace, for the past seven centuries officially associated with the See of Canterbury, and a focus of the history of England. The most interesting features of its story are well set forth by Mrs. Dorothy Gardiner in *The Story of Lambeth Palace* (Constable; 15s. net). Lord Davidson urged her to write it, and himself contributed the Preface. The volume is provided with a dozen interesting illustrations.

The Coming of the Kingdom, by Mr. Maldwyn L. Edwards, M.A. (Epworth Press, 2s. net), is 'written for young people who are anxious to be loyal to the tradition of their elders but find it difficult to interpret religion in the old terms.' It purports to set forth the Kingdom as 'a perfect adjustment of society and the individual.' Now the Kingdom is much more than this, as, of course, the writer clearly shows. But the phrase indicates the bias of his mind. The Kingdom is much too closely identified with social reform and collectivism, and the emphasis is not quite placed where the New Testament places it. Some of the writer's generalizations, also, are rather hasty, as, for example, his picture of the unity and harmony of the Middle Ages and his reference to the bearing of modern science on the possibility of a catastrophic coming of the Kingdom. Surely in regard to this last it should be recognized that science has no competence, and makes no claim, to say either Yea or Nay. At the same time there is much wise Christian teaching in the book, and a warm-hearted appeal which may well fire youthful souls with zeal for the service of the Kingdom.

In *A History of the Consecration of Churches and Churchyards* (Heffer; 6s. net) the Reverend R. W. Muncey, M.A., deals in scholarly fashion with the history of consecrations from the earliest Christian times. He has collated the relevant passages from the Decrees of Councils and ancient writers, and makes an interesting story. We commend this work for its intrinsic merit. Our admiration is increased when we learn that this scholar is a hard-worked parish clergyman. Amid multitudinous duties he has 'gathered up the fragments' of his time to good purpose.

A very pleasing and worthy memorial of a great historic occasion is presented in *The Kirk in Scotland, 1560-1929* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It consists of three chapters—the first, 'The Historical Background of Union,' and the third, 'The Future,' are written by Mr. John Buchan; the second, 'The Union Assembly,' by Principal Sir George Adam Smith. Those names are sufficient pledge of competent work, literary charm, and artistic selection of material that in less able hands might have proved intractable within reasonable limits. The volume is embellished with four interesting views of features of the great Union Assembly, selected by Sir D. Y. Cameron, who also designed the title-page.

'When the ancient Britons first landed in Britain, they were an educated and warlike race with a civilization equal and in some respects similar to the Greeks. Their cradle was Chaldæa, their nursery Egypt. In the sciences they excelled all the nations of the world, and their religion was the uncontaminated pure worship of the Patriarchs.' So says the Preface to *A Peculiar People; or, A Nation and a Company of Nations*, by Mr. H. E. Proctor (Marshall Press; 7s. 6d. net). The book does not apparently even attempt to demonstrate that claim. It assumes that the British people of to-day, like the Britons of old, are Israel, and consists of a curious medley of history and legend and imagination arranged in chronological order.

Readers interested in Babylonian tablets will welcome *Sumerian Contracts from Nippur*—the Sayce and H. Weld Collection in the Ashmolean Museum—by Professor G. R. Hunter, M.A., D.Phil., Professor of History in Morriss College, Nagpur, India (Oxford University Press; 12s. net). The publication forms vol. viii. of the Oxford editions of Cuneiform Texts, edited under the direction of Professor Langdon of Oxford. The tablets which form the subject-matter of the work were obtained in Mesopotamia by the latter from Arabs, and were purchased with funds supplied by Professor Sayce and Herbert Weld, D.Litt. Most of them form a single group, dealing with the business activities of one man and his family and friends.

They include sales, maintenance, loans, exchange, and adoption. The tablets are given in Sumerian, with a transliteration and translation, and there is a list of the personal and other names in alphabetical order. The publication is of value to the Old Testament student as throwing additional light on the ancient laws of property many centuries before Moses.

Christians in China before the Year 1550, by Mr. A. C. Moule (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), is a scholarly work of the highest value. The Church in the West has little or no idea of the extent to which Christianity penetrated Central and Eastern Asia in the early centuries, and of the long tragic story of persecutions and spiritual decay which led to its extinction over vast areas. Mr. Moule with immense learning and industry has gathered together the chief documentary evidences of the presence of Christians in China throughout the Middle Ages. Among other things he gives an account of the famous Christian monument at Hsi-an-fu, of the equally famous mission of Rabban Sauma to the Pope, of the travels of Marco Polo, and the missionary labours of John de Monte Corvino. The book is intended rather for the serious student than for the general reader, but even the bare record of ancient inscriptions and official documents touches the imagination, revealing as it does how great Eastern potentates were dimly groping after the Faith, and how Christian communities came to be scattered over the north and east of China in sufficient numbers to require a special department of the government for their care. The value of the book is increased by a considerable number of excellent illustrations and maps.

For an excellent introduction to the Cambridge Platonists get a small book by Mr. G. P. H. Pawson, *The Cambridge Platonists and their Place in Religious Thought* (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). It is the Hulsean Prize Essay, with an addendum which we wish had been longer. If modesty in producing written matter can be carried to an extreme, it has been so here. What we have is first-rate. We shall look with keen anticipation for more.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY REVEREND J. W. JACK, M.A., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

APART from the Biblical narrative, we are mainly dependent on the excavation of *tells* and other remains for information concerning the religious practices, customs, and civilization of ancient Palestine, and the outside influences to which the country was peculiarly exposed. Hence the value of the numerous archaeological expeditions which are at present working in the Near East. By unearthing buried cities, as well as by field-work, air photography, and other means, they are reconstructing the past of Israel, determining the age and character of sites, filling up gaps in the chronological scheme, and revealing the movements that came at various periods from Egypt, Syria, Babylonia, Cyprus, and the Ægean.

Professor Garstang, for example, by his recent careful and thorough examination of buried Jericho, has succeeded in determining the precise date of its destruction. For twenty years the prevalent idea among many scholars, based on the conclusions of Drs. Watzinger and Sellin, has been that the city was destroyed soon after 1600 B.C. (the beginning of the Late Bronze Age), and that consequently the site in Joshua's time was desolate, 'a heap of ruins on which stood perhaps a few isolated huts.' But Professor Garstang, with the independent assistance in certain matters of Père Vincent and Dr. Clarence Fisher, has produced clear evidences that the solid inner brick wall, about twelve feet thick, was not constructed till the Late Bronze Age, and was destroyed about 1400 B.C., the destruction being shown by reddened masses of burnt bricks, grey ash, and other traces of intense fire. The date has been partly reached from the important fact that not a single fragment of Mycenaean ware has been found among the ten thousand potsherds associated with the destruction of the walls or among the remaining fifty thousand found in the ruins of the city. As it is known that this type of pottery entered Palestine about 1350 B.C., and a specimen of it has been found just outside the walls, it is clear that the destruction of Jericho took place about 1400 B.C., the precise date of the invasion of Palestine by the Hābiru, who are usually identified with the Hebrews, an invasion described in the famous *Tell el-Amarna* Letters. This unanimous conclusion of the excavators is of great interest and importance, as the date assigned corresponds with that of the Biblical Joshua.

Equally important are the excavations which have just been made, under the British School of Egyptian Archaeology, by Sir Flinders Petrie at the great Hyksos fortress of Beth-pelet (*Tell Fara*), eighteen miles south of Gaza, on the borders of Egypt. Here the civilization of the Shepherd Kings, a knowledge of which is so essential to Biblical study, has been laid bare. The period of their rule, one of the most obscure in Egyptian history, is now much clearer owing to the discovery of twenty-five Hyksos graves and over a hundred scarabs. The succeeding age, that of the Philistine lords or *seren* (apparently the plural of *ser* or *sar*, the ruler of the nome in Egypt), who seem to have acted under the suzerainty of the Pharaohs, has also had considerable light thrown on it, and we now have a full and clear view of the burial customs of these rulers. The excavations reveal the military importance of the city, even in the time of David and Solomon. Doubtless it was its strength that made the Pelethites under Benaiah so powerful as David's bodyguard and the main factor in the politics of his reign. It is evident, moreover, that the position of Shishak has been greatly underrated. Not only did he conquer Jerusalem, but he was the greatest builder in South Palestine, and a much more important ruler than has been described in the Book of Kings. Apart from the massive buildings which he erected, tens of thousands of men must have been occupied in rearing the great wall, twenty-two feet thick, built of hard bricks nearly double the usual size, and laid in clean sand foundations five or six courses deep. One other fact about Beth-pelet deserves mention. In the lowest part of the *tell* (the neolithic), a settlement nine feet in depth was found, going back to over 4000 B.C., and giving evidence that the people of this remote age made many little clay figures of dogs. Strange to say, it is just in this region, some three thousand years later, that the Kenizzites or dog-tribe, with the name Caleb ('a dog'), appear in history as allies of Judah.

At *Tell Beit Mirsim*, the Biblical Debir or Kiriath-sepher, thirteen miles south-west of Hebron, where the joint expedition of the Pittsburgh Xenia Seminary and the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem have been at work, the excavators have provided us with a complete purview of the history of culture in Palestine from

before 2000 B.C. to the time of the final destruction of the town by Nebuchadrezzar in 586 B.C. The expedition has included President Kyle, Professor W. F. Albright, Dr. Saarisalo of Helsinki, and other scholars, along with a number of trained surveyors and draughtsmen from the Near East. The remains of ten successive cities have been found, each level being distinctly marked by a layer of ashes. The many cult objects and scarabs afford evidence of a wonderful parallelism between Biblical and secular history, and the excavators believe that the finds when properly studied may provide us with valuable chronological information for the dates of Abraham, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, the Exodus, and the Conquest of Canaan. It has been conjectured from the name Kiriath-sepher ('city of writing' or 'city of scribe') that the place was one of those centres of Canaanitish learning, where, as in the libraries of Babylonia and Assyria, a number of scribes resided and worked, and where old archives were kept.

A vast amount of exploration, in the interests of archæology, has recently been made in Babylonia. Much of it throws a welcome light on Hebrew tradition and history. At Ur, the home of Abraham, the work has brought to light material evidence of the Flood. After digging down thirty feet or more (over an area thirty yards by twenty yards), through no less than eight old civilizations, one above the other, the excavators suddenly came upon a seam of perfectly clean sand, water-laid and about eleven feet in thickness. This sand could only have been due to an immense Flood. The excavators dug down below the sand into the pre-diluvian stratum, and found there mud floors, household rubbish, sherds of pottery, and other signs of human occupation, as well as graves with coloured pottery and with clay figurines which seem to have a religious connexion. At one point was a great tumbled mass of red and black material, evidently the remains of a reed hut plastered with clay which had been burned down before the Flood. Close to the hut were found some real clay bricks, showing that the people of that distant age also lived in brick buildings—a proof of a much higher state of civilization than would have been expected. Here, six thousand or more years ago, the inhabitants dwelt till the Flood came, depositing a deep layer of sand over the top of everything. All this is supported by the remarkable excavations recently carried out at Kish near Babylon, over one hundred miles north of Ur, by Mr. L. Ch. Watelin and others, with the collaboration of Professor Langdon of Oxford. Below the deep,

upper stratum they came on a similar thick layer of sand, and beneath this they struck the pre-diluvian civilization. At a depth of twenty-one feet beneath the sand they found the early tombs of the mighty men of Kish, who lived long before the days of Noah. By sinking some shafts nine feet lower still, to virgin soil, they discovered painted ware, neolithic implements, and other signs of the earliest population that existed in Mesopotamia, certainly before 5000 B.C. It is clear that Babylonia contains secrets of the utmost importance, which may yet throw a marvellous light on the early chapters of Genesis.

Several Semitic inscriptions and a large number of Phœnician tablets have been discovered lately in Syria, Mesopotamia, and elsewhere. Some of the inscriptions, especially those from Byblos, Ras Shamra, and Sinai, dating as far back as the second millennium B.C., are of great importance for the study of the earliest Phœnician alphabet. Palestine proper, particularly in the middle and southern regions, is acknowledged to be poor in epigraphic material of early date, but at Beth-shemesh (modern *Tell Rumeileh*, half-way between Jerusalem and the Mediterranean), an inscription in ancient Phœnician characters has been unearthed by the Haverford Archæological Expedition, Pennsylvania, under Professor E. Grant. The fragment, which measures $31\frac{1}{2}$ by $27\frac{1}{2}$ inches, was found in the top stratum of the Middle Bronze Age, and may therefore be dated about 1600 B.C. There are two lines of text on the concave side, and five on the other. It is impossible, unfortunately, to discover the meaning, as only ten of the letters remain fairly clear. But the writing, which has been done with ink (the same dark colouring matter found on Canaanite pottery) and is not unlike that on the Agricultural Tablet from Gezer (c. 900 B.C.), though far more archaic, seems to be Canaanitish or perhaps early Hebrew. Its importance lies in the fact that here we have proof that the inhabitants were in possession of alphabetical writing, as distinct from the cuneiform, for many ages before Joshua. We cannot be guided in this matter by the scarcity of such evidence, for most inscriptions in ink have probably been obliterated by the humidity of the winter climate. It is clear that, while the cuneiform was used for official intercommunication and similar purposes, the ordinary literary activities of the land were carried on in the Semitic alphabet, which was well known to the Canaanites and Hebrews as far back as the Bronze Age. The mention in the Pentateuch of writing on stone, or in a book with ink as early as the Hebrew

Conquest, is far from being an anachronism. Even though the narrative dates as late as the ninth century, the historical setting is true.

Though many of the expeditions at work in Palestine are not concerned directly with questions of Old Testament accuracy, it deserves to be said

that their results tend to corroborate the Biblical narratives, even in matters of local colour and circumstantial detail. They are certainly dispelling the clouds of apparent unreality which have long enveloped the events of those distant ages.

National Contributions to Biblical Science.

VI. The Contribution of France to New Testament Science.

BY VINCENT TAYLOR, PH.D., D.D., FERENS PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE AND CLASSICS AT HEADINGLEY WESLEYAN COLLEGE, LEEDS.

I.

IN studying the contribution of France to New Testament scholarship it is necessary to go back at least as far as the close of the seventeenth century to Richard Simon, the French Oratorian priest, who is described by A. Loisy as *le père de la critique biblique et la victime du grand Bossuet*.¹ Simon's distinction is that he separated the New Testament from the Old as a sphere of special study, and applied to its problems principles both of literary and textual criticism. His immediate influence was in Germany² rather than in France, where the views of the powerful Bishop of Meaux, and his estimate of the Biblical writings, remained dominant until comparatively recent times.³ It is useful to recall the influence of Bossuet since he furnishes an example of the ecclesiastical reactions which are characteristic of the story of French criticism down to its most recent phases.

In an atmosphere unsuited to constructive research, progress could be made only by means of violent opposition, and in part this explains the satiric shafts launched by Voltaire against the Church and its clergy in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique*. Rousseau's views are mainly of social and political importance; but his rejection of revelation and theology in the brilliant pages of *Émile* (1762) awoke a bitter hatred which drove him from Paris and compelled him to become a wanderer in Switzerland, England, and Prussia.

¹ *Autour d'un petit livre*, 1903, p. 23.

² Cf. J. Moffatt, *Introduction*, 6.

³ He describes them as books *toujours saintes, toujours sacrées, toujours inviolables*. Cf. his *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, II. xxvii.

With Ernest Renan, French rationalism at length became constructive. The extent to which this is the case has not always been fully recognized, for his supreme achievement, the *Vie de Jésus* (1863), has overshadowed his more enduring, but less dazzling, contributions to New Testament criticism. The fact remains that his critical views regarding the Fourth Gospel are, with notable exceptions, those of modern liberal scholars. This is evident in his favourable estimate of the chronological and topographical data; his rejection of allegorical interpretations; his recognition of the use of special traditions belonging to the school of John, notably with reference to the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem; his defence of the Johannine dates for the Cleansing and the Last Supper; above all, in his contention that the author is one of John's disciples, and that to some extent the gospel is connected with the Apostle himself. It is, however, as the author of the *Vie de Jésus* that Renan has left his mark on the story of historical criticism; in comparison with this work his other writings, including even *Les Apôtres* (1866), *Saint Paul* (1867), and *L'Antéchrist* (1873), are now almost forgotten. No small part of the importance of his work lies in the clarity with which he defined the task of criticism. He wittily compared the orthodox theologian to a caged bird, and the liberal theologian to a bird with some of its feathers clipped whose plight is not discerned until it begins to fly. 'We proclaim it boldly,' he writes, 'critical inquiries relative to the origin of Christianity will not have said their last word.'

⁴ Cf. my article, 'Renan and the Fourth Gospel,' in *The Contemporary Review*, Dec. 1927.

until they shall have cultivated, in a purely secular and profane spirit, the method of the Hellenists, the Arabs, the Hindus, people strangers to all theology, who think neither of edifying, nor of scandalizing, nor of defending, nor of overthrowing dogmas.'¹ This is a noble plea for impartiality; but the want of recognition of the need for sympathy in historical inquiries into the origins of Christianity is as remarkable as the sound emphasis laid upon the necessity of the scientific spirit.

An intense interest in Christian origins was stimulated by the work of Renan. Lives of Christ poured from the printing presses in rapid succession, the most notable on the Protestant side being that of E. Pressensé, which passed through many editions, and was translated into English; and on the Catholic side that of Père Didon. During this period more solid contributions to New Testament scholarship were made in the exegetical works of the French-Swiss theologians—F. Godet and H. Oltramare. Godet wrote learned commentaries on *Romans* (1879), *Luke* (1871-2, 1888), and *John* (4th ed., 1903), and Oltramare on *Romans* (1881-2). To the same period belong the contributions of A. Réville and A. Sabatier. A Protestant pastor, Réville became Professor of the History of Religions at the Collège de France: his principal works are his *Histoire des Religions* (1883-9) and his *Jésus de Nazareth* (1906), a critical study of the antecedents of the gospel story and of the life of Jesus. Sabatier's *Esquisse d'une Philosophie de la Religion* (1897) attracted great interest in France, even among Catholics, and has won great popularity in Great Britain and America.² J. Réville is yet another Protestant scholar of marked liberal tendencies. In 1901 he published his *Le Quatrième Évangile*, an allegorical treatment of the Fourth Gospel which the late Dr. Sanday described as 'absolutely one-sided.' Among Catholic scholars of the period reference must be made to Abbé (afterwards Monsignor) Duchesne who, although constantly an object of suspicion, occupied a position of great influence at the *Institut Catholique* of Paris from 1878 to 1905. The last decade of the nineteenth century saw the earliest work of A. Loisy, the outstanding figure in the modern period. At this time already, his essays, which dealt mainly with questions of Text and Canon, were causing uneasiness in ecclesiastical circles; and the publication of two articles on 'The Biblical

Problem and the Inspiration of Scripture' in 1893 led to his dismissal, without explanation, from his professorship at the *Institut Catholique*. Greater offence was given by his essays on *La Religion d'Israël*; but the real issue was not joined until the publication of *L'Évangile et l'Église* (1902), which marks the dividing line in Loisy's stormy career, and is perhaps the most fascinating work on gospel origins ever written.

II.

L'Évangile et l'Église was written with the object of determining the exact historical position of Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums* (1900). Loisy explicitly denied that it was in any sense an attempt to write an apologia for Catholicism or traditional dogma.³ In this persuasion he was so far right that his principal antagonist was himself: he wanted to find standing ground for himself as both a fearless critic and a loyal son of the Church. Harnack's attempt to find the kernel of Christianity in faith in a merciful God revealed by Jesus aroused in his mind the strongest opposition; it left out of account the traditional element in the teaching of Jesus, the eschatological idea of the Kingdom, and left no room for the subsequent developments in the history of the Church. Loisy's central ideas are seen in his characteristic metaphors: the idea of a reverberating echo which becomes the more sonorous the farther it travels, and the picture of the tree whose essence appears as truly in its leaves and branches as in the germ from which it springs. The foundation principle is the idea of development which appealed so strongly to the mind of Newman. Perhaps no quotation gives Loisy's central conception so well as the following: 'The truly evangelical part of Christianity to-day is not that which has never changed, for, in a sense, all has changed and has never ceased to change; but that which in spite of all external changes proceeds from the impulse given by Christ, and is inspired by His Spirit, serves the same ideal and the same hope.'⁴

The value of this position was that it left Loisy free to accept the most radical views regarding gospel origins. Did it matter if sayings of Jesus like Mt 16¹⁸ were not historical? 'Jesus foretold the kingdom, and it was the Church that came.'⁵ *C'est la foi au Christ qui a fondé l'Église*.⁶ Was it a matter of decisive importance that the rites and

¹ Preface to the 13th ed. of the *Life of Jesus* (1867), p. xiv.

² Sabatier's study of Paulinism in *L'Apôtre Paul* (3rd ed. 1896) is also widely known and valued.

³ *The Gospel and the Church*, 2.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 115 f.

⁵ *Autour d'un petit livre*, 172.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 166.

dogmas of the Church could not be traced back to determinative words of Jesus? Rites came into being as the satisfaction of patent needs, and even when pagan in origin, they ceased to be pagan when accepted and interpreted by the Church. The Greek interpretation of Christian doctrine was born 'through the spontaneous effort of the faith to define itself'; Athanasius and the other doctors only gave it the rigour of a system. Each step followed from the preceding step, so that from the Evangelical Society around Jesus it was possible to proceed to the Papacy without meeting any violent opposition.

It can hardly be a matter of surprise that *L'Évangile et l'Église* was condemned by Cardinal Richard, the Archbishop of Paris, for, as the story of Newman shows, Rome has never been at ease with the idea of development. The price exacted was much too high. 'Who will consent to accept the yoke of the Church,' asked Lagrange, 'if she has not been instituted by Jesus Christ, and if nothing proves that Jesus Christ is God?'¹ But the end did not come at once. Only ten of the eighty French bishops associated themselves with the condemnation of the Archbishop of Paris, and it was not until Loisy had published *Le Quatrième Évangile* (1903) and *Les Évangiles Synoptiques* (1908), and had examined in detail the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi* in his *Simplex Réflexions* (1908), that the sentence of major excommunication was pronounced upon him. It is out of these experiences that the clue must be sought to the rapid output and increasingly radical character of Loisy's subsequent critical works. *L'Évangile et l'Église* was written, as he tells us, as *une œuvre d'espérance et de vie*, as *un hommage au Christ-Dieu, et à l'Église, corps vivant du Christ immortel*.² Loisy wanted to remove the reproach of obscurantism which lay heavy upon the Church, and to demonstrate that in critical matters the Catholic was as free as the Protestant or even the unbeliever. The hope failed, and the results appear in the later works, which become more and more sceptical, until it is made a matter of reproach by Couchoud that Loisy has not relinquished belief in the historical existence of Jesus.³ In the republished form of *Le Quatrième Évangile* (1921), the unity of the Gospel is abandoned; in *Les Actes des Apôtres* (1920) the hypothesis of an original work of A.D. 80, mutilated and expanded

forty years later by a Roman presbyter, is put forward; and in *L'Évangile selon Luc* (1924) a similar thesis is maintained with respect to the Third Gospel. Everywhere the influence of the Cultus on the historical records is visible; the words of Jesus are utterances of faith reflecting the views of contending parties; the history is lost beneath the débris of legends and inventions until little is left beyond the fact that Jesus was condemned by Pilate and died upon the Cross. It is perhaps true to say that Loisy's story is an even greater contribution to New Testament science than that made by his published works. His personality influences all later French critical research, even the most recent, and in the international world of Biblical scholarship no French writer is so well known.

III.

Loisy by no means represents the most radical element in French criticism. Several scholars, including P. L. Couchoud, R. Stahl, and, with certain reservations, S. Reinach, deny outright the historical existence of Jesus. For Couchoud 'Jesus is not a man gradually becoming a God, but a God gradually becoming a man.'⁴ He finds it inconceivable that in less than a single generation Jesus should have been deified, and maintains that, historically, He escapes us. The evidence from secular historians is worthless, while the Gospels are not histories but mystical writings in which visionary experiences have passed from a lyrical to a narrative form. Stahl is the author of a strange work entitled *Le Document 70* (1923). This document is the fragment of a Jewish Apocalypse found by Wellhausen in Rev 12, and, according to Stahl, it represents the oldest Christian record. All the letters of Paul are held to be unauthentic, though Paul is a real person whose modified portrait is preserved in the Acts; and the history of the development of Christianity is found in the series—Document 70, the Apocalypse, the Fourth Gospel, and the Synoptics. These two writers sometimes work together. In an article in *La Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* (Jan.-March 1928) they go beyond Loisy in explaining the Acts as the work of two second-century writers, a Paulinistic

⁴ Couchoud's views are outlined in *Le Mystère de Jésus* (1924), which has been translated into English, with a foreword by Sir J. G. Fraser, for the Rationalist Press Association under the title *The Enigma of Jesus*.

⁵ *The Enigma of Jesus*, 91.

¹ Cited from *La Revue Biblique* (1/4/03) in *Autour d'un petit livre*, 290.

² *Op. cit.*, 21 f.

³ Cf. *The Enigma of Jesus*, 65-76.

and a Catholic redactor.¹ Couchoud has also defended the thesis that Mark was written in Latin.²

Another radical who accepts, however, the historical existence of Jesus, is C. Guignebert, Professor at the Sorbonne. Guignebert's work is based upon a knowledge of foreign research and a close study of the works of Loisy and Lagrange. His earlier works are historical. More recently he has contributed two volumes to the *Bibliothèque de Culture générale*,³ entitled *Le Problème de Jésus* (1914) and *La Vie cachée de Jésus* (1921). The latter work leaves the hidden life of Jesus in yet deeper obscurity. Jesus, it is admitted, was actually born in Galilee of humble parents, but when, where, and under what conditions, we do not know, since almost everything in Mt 1, 2 and Lk 1, 2 is Christian legend derived from dogmatic and apologetic needs. This work is especially interesting, because it is offered to the educated French public as a substitute for the poetic idyll of Renan, whose Jesus—so Guignebert believes—‘does not resemble the true Galilean much more than that of Père Didon.’⁴

In *Le Quatrième Évangile* (1925) H. Delafosse follows Loisy in positing two stages in the composition of the Fourth Gospel: the original work is that of a Marcionite writer about A.D. 135, the final version being that of a Catholic redactor about the period A.D. 170–5. This argument is worked out in great detail, and the entire text is given with variations of type to illustrate the supposed stages of redaction. The writers mentioned above add little or nothing to the understanding of the New Testament, but they represent a certain tendency in French criticism, and incidentally show how impossible it is to speak in any summary fashion of ‘the French School.’

In France the hypothesis of a mythical Jesus has found its strongest opponent in the liberal Protestant scholar, M. Goguel, whose *Introduction au Nouveau Testament* began to be published in 1922 (*Le Livre des Actes*, 1922; *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, 1923; *Le Quatrième*, 1924; *Les*

Épîtres Pauliniennes, 1925–26). Goguel is best known in Great Britain by his *Jésus de Nazareth—mythe ou histoire* (1925), which was translated and published in England in 1926. A more spirited and scholarly exposure of the theories of Reinach, Couchoud, and Stahl could hardly be desired. The evidence of secular historians, and of Josephus in particular, is examined with great care, and full justice is done to the witness of Paul, the Gospels, and the New Testament generally. Other writers, on the Catholic side, who have shared in the defence, are L. de Grandmaison,⁵ M. J. Lagrange,⁶ P. Batiffol,⁷ and H. Pinard de la Boullaye.⁸ These writers naturally take a definitely conservative position. The more difficult task of maintaining a liberal position, while rejecting extreme rationalistic views, has fallen to a section of the Protestant writers, with results which do not always equal the strength and balance of the work of Goguel.⁹ French Protestantism, small in numbers and constantly on its defence, has yet to make its best contributions to New Testament Science. Already in Sabatier and Goguel it is represented by scholars of world-wide renown, but for the moment the richer harvests are those reaped by Catholic scholars who, by diligently tilling well-defined fields of research, are making valuable contributions to exegesis, textual criticism, and linguistic studies.

But before describing this latest phase, reference must be made, if only in passing, to the valuable work of French scholars who are helping to reconstruct the background against which the New Testament stands. Among those who have contributed to the better knowledge of the Pagan world the name of Franz Cumont stands in the front rank. His work on Mithras¹⁰ is described by A. Deissmann as ‘monumental.’ Other investigators in this province include P. Foucart (*Mémoire sur l'affranchissement des esclaves*, 1866), A. Réville (*Histoire des Religions*, 1883–9), J.

¹ *Jésus dans l'Histoire et dans le Mystère* (1925).

² *Quelques Remarques sur 'l'Orpheus'* (1910).

³ *Orpheus et l'Évangile* (1910); *L'Église naissante* (7th ed., 1919).

⁴ *Jésus et l'Histoire* (1929).

⁵ See Professor Gossip's review of C. Piepenbring's *Jésus historique* in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xxxiv. 264 f.

¹⁰ *Textes et Monuments figurés relatifs aux Mystères de Mithra* (1899). His *Les Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain* (1906; 2nd ed., 1909) has been translated into English, *The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism* (Chicago, 1911).

¹ The title of the article is *Les deux auteurs des Actes des Apôtres*. See the review in the *Hibbert Journal* for July, 1929.

² Cf. *La Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1926, pp. 161–92. British readers had a characteristic example of the work of Couchoud and Stahl in the article, ‘Jesus Barabbas,’ *Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1926.

³ A series corresponding to our *Home University Library*.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. v.

Toutain (*Les Cultes païens dans l'Empire romain*, 1907), S. Reinach (*Cultes, Mythes, et Religions*, 1904-13), and H. Pinard de la Boullaye (*L'Étude comparée des Religions*, 1929). In the study of language the greatest name is that of Lagrange (see later). Important contributions have also been made by J. Viteau, E. Boisacq, J. Psichari, and J. Rouffiac.¹ In the realm of source criticism valuable work has been done by F. Nicolardot. B. S. Easton has recently said that in some respects his *Les Procédés de Rédaction des trois premiers Évangélistes* (1908) was a more important book than Loisy's *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*, and has expressed the opinion that 'current New Testament study would profit by a renewed examination of Nicolardot.'² France is also taking her part in the study of the form (*Formgeschichte*) which the units of primitive tradition assumed during the oral period. In a recent article³ M. Dibelius names among the French contributors to this new inquiry O. Cullmann, Goguel, and Loisy.

IV.

It might have been thought that after the decree *Lamentabili* and the encyclical *Pascendi*, Roman Catholic New Testament scholarship was condemned to sterility; but such has not proved to be the case. If 'Modernist' speculations were banned, the more sober lands of grammar and exegesis were still open to cultivation by intensive methods. These fields have not called in vain. On the contrary, and to the advance of Biblical scholarship in general, they have been occupied by labourers fully equipped with knowledge, skill, and patience. The outstanding names are those of M. J. Lagrange and E. Jacquier. Both scholars are contributors to the series of learned commentaries known as *Études Bibliques*. E. B. Allo is the author of the commentary on the Apocalypse in the same series, and an earlier contributor was Th. Calmes, who wrote commentaries on the *Apocalypse* and the *Fourth Gospel*. Another Roman Catholic scholar who has made the theology of St. Paul an object of special study is F. Prat,⁴ while the Synoptic parables and the allegories of the Fourth

Gospel have been ably treated by D. Buzy in his *Introduction aux Paraboles Évangéliques* (2nd ed., 1912).

Abbé Jacquier has written the commentary on the *Acts* (1926), a voluminous work of some eleven hundred closely printed pages, containing a full and thorough discussion of all the leading problems of Introduction and exegesis. He is also the author of an earlier work in four volumes, *Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament* (1903-8), and of a remarkable detailed work on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament, *Le Nouveau Testament dans L'Église chrétienne* (ii. [1913]), which treats the subject with a fulness unequalled by that of any other French work, and is especially valuable for the opinion expressed on the views of Westcott and Hort, Kenyon, Gregory, and von Soden. The industry of Père Lagrange is even greater. He has written learned commentaries on each of the Four Gospels⁵ and on the *Epistles to the Romans* and the *Galatians*. He is also the author of an earlier important work on the Messianic Hope, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs* (1909), and recently, with the assistance of C. Laverne, he has published a handsome volume, *Synopsis Evangelica* (1926), which gives the Greek text of the Gospels in a continuous form, on the basis of the order of Luke and John. Laverne, it may be added, has recently published a French translation of the Gospels, *Synopse des Quatre Évangiles* (1927), supplied with indexes, tables, and notes based on the commentaries of Lagrange.

A French Dominican, long resident in Jerusalem, Père Lagrange stands in the van of modern New Testament scholarship. His commentaries on the Gospels are of the highest value and particularly on the linguistic side. The Introductions are long and full, and, as may be expected, frequent reference is made to the views of Loisy. Lagrange is a learned Semitist who at the same time is able to do full justice to the popular character of New Testament Greek. He has resisted the temptation to find in Mark the translation of an Aramaic original. Mark's Greek, he maintains, 'is always Greek, yet translation Greek; not that he translates an Aramaic writing, but because he reproduces an Aramaic *κατήχησις*.'⁶ On the other hand, and here it may be that traditional views of authorship are not inoperative, he holds that Matthew was

¹ Cf. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ii., for the references to the works of these writers.

² *The Gospel before the Gospels*, p. 17. Cf. also V. H. Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. 370 f.

³ 'Zur Formgeschichte der Evangelien' in the *Theologische Rundschau*, 1929, Heft 3.

⁴ *La Théologie de S. Paul*, 1929, i. 15th ed.; ii. 14th ed.

⁵ *Évangile selon S. Marc* (1920); *Évangile selon S. Luc* (1921); *Évangile selon S. Matthieu* (1923); *Évangile selon S. Jean* (1925).

⁶ Cf. W. F. Howard in Moulton's *Grammar*, ii. 481.

originally written in Aramaic.¹ Luke, he says, was not a Jew either by birth or education, and if he was of Syrian origin, 'nothing proves that Aramaic was his mother tongue.'² Lagrange has naturally given the closest attention to the attempt of the late Canon Burney to prove that the Fourth Gospel is the translation of an Aramaic work. Here, while recognizing the evident signs of the Evangelist's Semitic temperament, which prove that he was a Jew and probably a Palestinian Jew, he maintains that there is no need to go further and affirm the Greek Gospel to be a translation: *Rien ne nous y oblige, et la tradition ne nous y invite pas*.³

Both Lagrange and Jacquier naturally face difficulties when questions arise on which ecclesiastical tradition, and the Papal Biblical Commission, have made definite pronouncements, as, for example, the question of the priority of Mark, the joint authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, and the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Here critical expedients become necessary. On the question of authorship, recourse is made to the theory of dictation and of the use of different amanuenses. Thus, in speaking of the Fourth Gospel, Lagrange says: 'Nothing forbids that John, dictating his Gospel to a very discreet secretary, may have left a certain liberty in the choice of forms, so as to take care of the grammar without removing anything in the particular character of the style,'⁴ while Jacquier accounts for the language and style of the Pastorals by the supposition that 'St. Paul had not now the same secretary as when he wrote his earlier epistle.'⁵ These opinions awake sympathy rather than conviction, but where the critical ice is stronger their treatment leaves little to be desired. In particular, the influence of the commentaries of Lagrange is becoming increasingly manifest in British critical works on the Gospels.

This survey, I hope, while not pretending to be

exhaustive, will show how important the French contribution to New Testament Science is; it will also show that for the most part it is comparatively modern. This fact receives a striking illustration in the contents of the late Dr. Sanday's *Life of Christ in Recent Research*, which was published in 1908. The outstanding feature of that work is its preoccupation with the labours of German scholars, but only less remarkable is its entire neglect, apart from a passing reference to Renan, of French critics, including even Loisy. Needless to say, this is due, not to any oversight on the part of Dr. Sanday, but to the situation as it existed. At that time the work of Loisy was in its beginnings, and the story of French criticism is really the story of Loisy and of the reactions to which his work has given rise. These reactions can be seen to-day both on the left and on the right: usually French New Testament scholars are either very radical or very orthodox. Whether a third approach is possible, which will combine boldness with the strength of conservatism, lies hidden among the secrets of the future. Signs of its presence are visible in the work of Goguel, but such a combination hardly represents the peculiar character of the French genius, which appears rather in its power to clothe a courage rising to audacity in the felicitous medium of a language unsurpassed for lucidity and delicacy of expression. For the most part, French criticism remains either the product of a revolutionary spirit or the work of a conservatism in bonds. But its peculiar character is also the measure of its worth. Nowhere have we so complete a demonstration of positions as they appear when fully worked out; nowhere else are the outlines so sharp and the shadows so black. It is just because French criticism is so national that its international importance is so great, for to the pertinacity of the German savant and the gravity and judgment of the British scholar it adds the passion of youth and courage. Not the least part of the French contribution lies in the great names it adds to the roll of international scholarship. Men like Simon, Renan, Sabatier, Loisy, Goguel, and Lagrange have left, and will continue to leave, a deep mark upon international criticism by their personalities as well as by reason of their numerous learned works.

¹ 'But his masterly array of the linguistic data is not convincing, especially when one observes how many of the Aramaisms are found in the teaching of Jesus,' *op. cit.*, ii. 481.

² *L'Évangile selon S. Luc*, xcvi.

³ *L'Évangile selon S. Jean*, cxviii.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, cxix.

⁵ *History of the Books of the New Testament*, i. 257.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

November.

BY THE REVEREND M. S. HOPKINS, B.A., ELY, CARDIFF.

'And Simon the Canaanite.'—Mk 3¹⁸.

NOVEMBER is the most dreary month of the year. I am sure you, boys and girls, do not like it a bit. One of our poets described it as a month of 'no sun, no moon, no stars—November.' He wrote a poem with a lot of lines like that, with words having 'no' before them, and finished it with the word 'November.'

You have no Christmas in November, no Easter, no Whitsun, and no long holidays as in August. All you have to make you jolly in November is Guy Fawkes' night, and that does not last long.

Yet we all know November when it comes, without being told that it is November. Of course, each month is different as each day of the week is different. You all know what Monday is like, don't you? It is a day for beginning things, and it is always hard to begin things. When Tuesday comes you feel in the middle of things once again and hard at work. Saturday is a jolly day, while Sunday—some of you do not like Sunday—but it is the best day of all.

It is the same with the months. We all know that each month has a peculiar characteristic of its own. January, well, that is like Monday; we begin things. We are full of life in January, and sometimes have a little snowballing. Of February we feel that it will soon go, and we look forward to March, when the Spring begins. Then comes April with its glorious sunshine, and sparkling showers in between. Sometimes, indeed more often than not, the Easter holidays come in April.

All the months are different and we know them when they come without any one telling us their names. For instance, when we see the daisies and the buttercups making beautiful coloured carpets of the green fields, and we notice that the days begin to lengthen, then we know that March has come and that Summer is not far away. March, like every month, has an atmosphere of its own.

So has November. It is the month of fogs, of rain, and sometimes snow. It is cold, dark and dreary. But then it has its place as a month of the year. We would not appreciate the joys of spring and summer if we did not experience the winter, nor the morning sun if we did not know the darkness of the night.

The disciples of Jesus were not of a similar nature and disposition. We know of St. Peter as being active and impulsive, St. John as being of a lovable nature, St. Thomas as one who wanted to see things before he believed them, Judas as being greedy. Each one had his own peculiar characteristics; but each one served his Master in his own way.

So do we too. So does each one of you. You, boys and girls, are all different from one another. It would not do at all for us to be built in the same way. A beautiful organ has many keys and different stops and they each one of them have different notes, but when they are touched, each one at the right moment, they give us most sublime music.

Do you know, whenever I think of November, I always think of one of the disciples of Jesus. You will find a list of their names in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. The eleventh disciple on both lists is named Simon the Canaanite, and as November is the eleventh month of the year, I, somehow, couple them together, November and Simon the Canaanite.

We do not read anything about Simon the Canaanite in the whole of the Gospels. There is no record of anything he did or said; we simply read his name as being one of the disciples of Jesus. We read a great deal about St. John, St. Peter, and St. James, but nothing about St. Simon the Canaanite. And yet he must have done much for Jesus. It is the same with the month November. It is not famous for flowers, or holidays, or any great events like children's treats, but it has its place as a month of the year, and we could not do without it.

So it is with all of us. We may not be great at cricket or football, or brilliant at our studies, but we have our place, each one of us, and God has a particular work for us to do.

Consider the Ravens.

BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER BAXTER, HAWICK.

'Consider the ravens: for they neither sow nor reap; which neither have storehouse nor barn; and God feedeth them.'—Lk 12²⁴.

When I began reading my text, and said 'Consider——' you thought I was going to say 'the lilies,' didn't you? Consider the ravens! the crows! why it makes us think of scarecrows. Crows! noisy, black, ugly creatures they are, and they steal! why, I know a little boy who was

rolling his hard-boiled Easter egg one afternoon and a crow swooped down and simply flew away with it. Consider the crows! yes, says the farmer, I'll consider them with a gun: look at the way they spoil my potatoes. Well, I suppose the crow is a thief, and the particular kind of crow Jesus speaks of—the raven—is a big thief. It will steal all kinds of things and seems to delight in tearing things to bits. It is greedy too, so greedy that we have made him into a greedy word—ravenous. But after all a crow is not a boy or girl. It can't help being greedy. It doesn't know any better. Let us rather consider one or two of the raven's good points.

Do you remember in the story of the Flood how Noah sent out two birds from the Ark, a dove and a raven? The dove, we are told, soon got weary and came back to shelter. But this is what we are told about the raven: It 'went to and fro until the waters were dried up on the face of the earth.' That suggests rather a good point, doesn't it? We have the picture of a tireless, eager, searching bird: persistent—it refuses to give in. 'Consider the raven.'

Then there is that story about the ravens feeding Elijah. I wonder if it really means that somehow Elijah, by watching the ravens, was able to find food for himself? At any rate people who know tell us that for its size the raven is perhaps the most perfect of birds. It has a splendid brain for a bird, and a fine nervous system. It is a bird very well able to look after itself and feed itself. It is wise, eager, and independent. Now, isn't it worth considering that that is the kind of bird about which Jesus says, 'God feedeth them'?

I read a lovely story about a crow which I want to tell you. It is told by Mr. Coulson Kernahan, who was a great lover of birds and flowers. His wife had a baby crow which had lost its mother and was too young to feed itself. Mrs. Kernahan had also a tame rook in her garden called 'Johnnie.' Now 'Johnnie' took over this baby crow and used to feed it day by day by poking food into its mouth. The baby crow seemed rather to enjoy this and didn't see why it should stop—in fact it got quite lazy as it grew bigger. 'Johnnie' got rather worried about this, and in order to make the crow find food for itself tried starving it. The crow squawked so much, however, that 'Johnnie' gave in and fed it. One day, however, 'Johnnie' was noticed collecting a little pile of curious things—tiny stones, broken snail shells, small bits of twigs, and even a rusty screw. Then he gave his usual call, and the crow came with open mouth to be

fed. Into its open mouth, however, 'Johnnie' proceeded to put the rusty screw, and the other things he had collected. You can imagine what happened—after that the lazy crow went and found food for itself. After it was all over we are told 'Johnnie' rolled over on his back with his legs in the air as if he was delighted with the success of his method.

'Consider the crows': 'God feedeth them': but He does not do it by all the time dropping food into their mouths. He gives them the power to help themselves, and they must use it. God has made them eager, wise, persistent, independent, and He says to them, 'Use your powers and I will feed you.' And so, boys and girls, we must work if we are to eat. We must seek if we are to find. We must learn if we are to be wise. We must try if we are to be good. Jesus said, 'My Father worketh hitherto, and I work.' God feeds us by giving us power to work and feed ourselves, by giving us power to help others who are not able to work, and so *He* feedeth us. Let us thank Him and remember the lesson of the ravens.

The Christian Bear.

SUNDAY BEFORE ADVENT.

The Right to become.

'As many as received him, to them gave he the right to become the sons of God.'—Jn 1¹².

Thinking of that sublime passage in St. John which says that 'as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become the sons of God,' we restrict ourselves to the mere fragment of a phrase—'the right to become.'

We have stripped the passage of its glory and of its infinite promise. The right to become—what? Anything at all! Deny the possibility of change and improvement, and we are scarce atoms, but mere indistinguishable particles in the cycle of existence.

1. But does anybody deny man that right? The right to become something? Yes; half the philosophies of the world, and much loose thinking that scarce deserves the name of philosophy. It is the characteristic assumption of most of the religions of the East that man is involved in a cycle of existence from which he cannot escape. It invades our own souls whenever we say, 'Vanity of vanities, all is vanity,' 'All things come alike to all: there is one event to the righteous, and to the wicked; to the clean, and to the unclean: to him that sacrificeth, and to him that sacrificeth

not; as the good, so is the sinner; and he that sweareth, as he that feareth an oath.'

Half the world is divided on that issue from the other half. Half of every man's single life also is divided from the other half upon that point. There are days and years and moods in which he says, 'I can become,' and there are others in which he says, 'I am nothing, and nothing matters.' We live through all the philosophies in the course of a lifetime without distinctly formulating them. We are not always Christians, in spite of our geography and settled convictions; sometimes we are Muhammadans, surrendered to Fate; sometimes we are Confucianists, treating God as an abstraction; sometimes we are Buddhists, desiring only to be melted back again into the one colourless omnipresent unity, where sleep is rest from desire. We are symposiums of all the religions, and of all the philosophies. It is only by a great effort and by great grace that a man can persist in saying of himself, 'I have the right to become—something!'

Mr. Chesterton, who has a genius for saying profound things in a seemingly frivolous way, has written recently, 'All religious history has really been a pattern of noughts and crosses.' He goes on to say that by noughts he does not mean nothings, but only things that are negative compared with the positive shape or pattern of the other. And then he makes the suggestive statement that the mind of Asia can really be represented by a round O, if not in the sense of a cypher, at least of a circle. The great Asiatic symbol of a serpent with its tail in its mouth is really a very perfect image of a certain idea of unity and recurrence that does indeed belong to the Eastern philosophies and religions. It really is a curve that in one sense includes everything, and in another sense comes to nothing.

With a certain fancifulness he reminds us that the symbol of Muhammadanism is a crescent, or part of a circle, and the scimitar itself is a part of a crescent. The Swastika, the parallel symbol of the Wheel of Buddha, consists of a crooked cross in the very act of returning to the recurrent curve. The idea is that of a wheel going round and round, of a serpent curved and swallowing its own tail; of all things recurring.

2. Sharply outlined against that background stands the Christian symbol of the Cross. It is a rugged thing at right angles, pointing boldly in opposite directions. In fact as well as in figure it stands for the idea of breaking out of the circle that is everything and nothing. It presents the idea of a conflict stretching outwards into eternity.

The soul requires for its health a conviction that there is a distinction between things. They are not all 'God' in the same sense. Right is not the same thing as wrong. Granted that our ideas of both are relative, and that they may both be seen in changing lights, no sane men would alter black and white until they were alike grey. No amount of toning down can make war the same thing as peace, or a lie the same thing as the truth, or lust the same thing as love.

The Cross of Christ, outlined against the sky, with its sharp right angles pointing boldly in opposite directions, the vertical beam thrust downward into the earth by all that is contrary to God, and the horizontal beam framing the strong arms of resistance, deliberately outstretched in opposition to the contrary principle, is the everlasting witness that in the world there is God and Not-God, right and wrong, truth and error. It calls to men to take sides. It gives the right to become, but only on condition that they, too, shoulder a cross and carry into life the symbol of contradiction.

In such fashion it saves the world. For the world depends for its moral health, and indeed for its sanity, upon clear convictions as to what, so to speak, is 'God' and what is 'Not-God,' or upon what is right and what is wrong. Philosophies that blur that distinction ought to be known as poison-gas. If our distinctions are but partial and are full of human error, the greatest possible error would be to make no distinctions. A community that could distinguish no difference between the wrong that needs resistance and the right that needs assistance would be on its way to perdition. A mentality that declared that 'nothing matters' would itself matter nothing. It would travel in a circle, thrust downward by its indifference, thrust up again by the urge of the moral law. It is a choice between noughts and crosses. By shouldering the Cross, any man, any society, can break through the circle and *become*.

Each one of us has a circle of personality through which we ought to break, and through which we can break by shouldering the Cross. No man should say that heredity has laid down conditions which compel him to travel in a circle. We can break the circle with a cross. There is conferred upon us the 'right to become.'

3. If the right be valid it carries with it as a corollary the other half of this passage. If a man has the right to become something—anything—better than he is, he has the right to become 'a son of God.' That is the message of the Cross. Through conflict and sacrifice to nobler conflict and sacrifice,

on and on, not to absorption but to affinity with God, not to extinction but to expansion, which is the true and only heaven in this world or some other.

We must protest against that conception of the Cross of Christ which makes it only an act of submission. That would be to make the Cross a Swastika, the crooked Cross turning again into a wheel. The Master's Passion was not a murmured 'Yes,' but a ringing 'No.' It was 'Yes' to God, but 'No' to the things that are contrary to God. The things that were 'Not-God' pleaded for compromise or acquiescence, and He answered 'No!' It was the most positive act in all His wonderful life. It was an act that enshrined all His philosophy so that He passed it on as teaching to all His disciples in all ages. 'If you would follow Me, take up your cross; if you would carry the cross, you must deny—or say "No"—to yourself.'¹

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

How far can Forgiveness go?

'Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'—Is 1st.

There is really nothing elsewhere in the Scriptures which goes so far as this declaration; for it will be noticed that it does not say merely that sin shall be washed away, but that sins which are scarlet shall themselves be made white as snow. This seems a statement of the impossible: stain can be removed, a person can be cleansed, but nothing can make sin other than what it is.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the common interpretation of the text should be challenged. And reference to the Hebrew will show that an altogether different rendering is equally possible. The words can be read as if they were an indignant rhetorical question: If your sins are as scarlet, shall they be white as snow?

But a good many scholars hesitate to accept this rendering and are desirous of retaining the statement as a promise; and, therefore, we shall be taking the safest line if we treat the text as a real question, the answer to which the prophet leaves open, with the burden of proving an affirmative answer resting on those who would argue that such an unthinkable thing is really possible.

1. All the laws of life seem to be against the doctrine of forgiveness. The linking of the universe in a chain of cause and effect, which can never be

reversed, broken, or interfered with, is an idea which has had its effect even upon the sphere of human morality; and, consequently, the doctrine of forgiveness has come to be regarded as impossible. All sin brings inevitable consequences; and there is no means of evading them. Even if the repentance of a person who has sinned be conceded as a possibility, and God be reconciled to the person as thus changed, yet this personal forgiveness cannot remit a single consequence of sin. The drunkard who has wasted his natural powers will still have to pay the penalty in his flesh, even if he immediately and entirely gives up his habits.

It becomes a grave question whether there can be any such thing as repentance, because sin has much worse consequences than its physical effects, which in the main only follow on physical sins, and then not inevitably or invariably falling on the person who committed them. The moral effects of sin, and especially of spiritual sins, strike at the very soul itself and render it incapable of repentance. How is a person who indulges in the vain imaginations prompted by pride ever to have his eyes opened to his actual conditions?

2. It is against such ideas that Christian forgiveness seems so inadequate. It claims that forgiveness is so complete that it wipes sin out altogether; it is not only the personal forgiveness of God, but the cleansing from the very guilt of sin, so that it need no longer rest in the memory, but can be treated as if it had not been.

The whole question turns upon the personal redemptive activity of God upon the soul of man. Forgiveness is a great human fact which proves the redemptive activity of God. If the automatic, self-contained system of ethics were true, individuals and the race as a whole would steadily get worse; for the actual consequences of sin are not only physical suffering, but moral blindness; and where there is moral blindness, there is no power even in suffering to open men's eyes. There must be some moral power, other than circumstances or man himself, which is always bearing in upon him, a light that does not go out when man shuts his eyes to it, but adjusts itself to his rebellion and by secret ways strives to influence his soul. If God was not forgiving, He would not continue to send forth His light and truth; and if He did not do that man would die. And God can do that because He is the Person He is, because He is Spirit, and therefore able to influence us in all kinds of secret ways from within ourselves, and yet without coercing us, because He acts upon us as one Person on another. And since He is love He is able to

¹ F. W. Norwood, *The Gospel of the Larger World*, 54.

persuade us into a union with Him that renovates our whole person. What is meant by forgiveness is in the first place that ; and it is the permanent attribute and the untiring activity of God.

3. But how much can that forgiveness accomplish ? It surely cannot alter facts. It cannot change the past. And therefore, how can it bring complete deliverance ? It must ever remain a fact that we have done these things : we must contain within ourselves not only the effect of that, but the responsibility for that, which surely we can never afford to forget, and for which we must for ever mourn. This would give us a repentance which was nothing but penitence, fruitless attempts at reparation ; our sins would have to be ever before us. True, and yet not to be thus concluded. By personal communion with us God gets us to look at things as He looks at them. He changes the natural attitude of the heart, and, consequently, the effect of the past is changed upon us. When it is said that we cannot alter facts, we must remember that a fact is not a thing in itself : it is a natural happening conjoined to an *effect* upon a person ; if you can change the person, you can change the effect. Therefore, God's forgiveness does alter facts in so far as it alters their effects.

But must there not always remain a mournful penitence ? We ourselves can never forget that we have done these things ; moreover, we can never forget that we have done these things to God, and in the Cross we get some glimpse of what it has cost God to get near enough to us to have any influence upon us ; how, when we look upon the Cross, can we forget our sins ? This is also true, but penitence must be distinguished from remorse, and from a sorrow that debilitates and paralyses us from doing anything but dissolving in floods of grief. As we look at the Cross we cannot help remembering our sins, but we cannot but remember also that He loved us in them. He loved us enough to take them upon Himself, the very sins we could not and would not feel, and this either dries the tears before they come, so that the penitence of the Christian is really nothing else than a profound gratitude ; or the tears we cannot keep back at the sight of the Cross are not for our sins, but for His wounds ; and not for sorrow, but for overwhelming joy at the revelation of such love. This is continually re-centring and re-making our nature round Him and His Cross.

But can this change consequences ? It has changed the most important consequences. The actual change which may be wrought in one's body by repentance for physical sins is not so important

as that the spiritual consequences, which are death, should be broken ; we are quite willing to bear the one ; to bear the other would be to suffer moral extinction. But, as a matter of fact, it is likely that there will be even different physical consequences. Just as it is possible for the body to recuperate after an illness, which may have been brought on by some form of injudiciousness, so the mere fact that sin ceases, and still more that there is a new concentration, a new peace, and freedom from inner anxiety, has an immediate effect upon the body.

But what about the effects upon others ? In some cases our sins have injured others. We should always strive to make what reparation is possible, but sometimes it is impossible. We may have helped some one down a moral abyss, and while we have been rescued, they have not. They may have passed beyond any possibility of appeal. There is for this the new power of prayer and intercession, which is certainly not arbitrarily broken by an event like death. Also we have to remember that our influence over others is never so great as to destroy their responsibility. Moreover, in coming into new relations with the Head of the redeemed race, we are helping to take away the sins of the whole world, to counteract the effect of evil forces.

Forgiveness, therefore, can go to tremendous lengths. The redeeming power of Christ is such that it does make sin as if it had never been, not only for the individual, but for the race and for human history. The Church has always been instinctively sure about this. Whatever the fall has been, the redemption of Christ is going to do something more than wipe it out ; it is going to bring about something which will be higher because of the fall. If the fall had not taken place, man might have continued something a little lower than the angels : but now, in order that the human race may never fall again, he is made something higher than the angels. Similarly with the individual.

This doctrine needs to be safeguarded from certain conclusions that might be hastily, though not rightly, drawn from it. It might be claimed that it is better that man should have sinned. Man, as he was made, was a creature perfect of his kind : there is no way of restoring him to that perfection ; but he is made something higher still : a perfection which is His own choice, and from which there is no further possibility of falling. But that does not mean that it is a good thing man fell : it is an evil thing ; only the consequences have been assumed by God, and by His love and

mercy they have been—not destroyed—but completely changed in their effects.

The question asked by the prophet, impossible as it seemed, is therefore answered in the affirmative. Before the consummation of all things, the sins of earth, crimson as they have been, will themselves have been made as white as snow, because their effects will live only in the being of God, where they have been transformed into greater love and greater beauty.

Sin has brought forth a propitiation; not the propitiation of God, nor the propitiation of man, but the propitiation of sin itself: an answer drawn from the heart of the Eternal, the God-man, our glorious Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the union in one Person of the Eternal Son of God and the crucified Son of man, the Father's satisfaction, our endless praise.¹

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

How Life shows itself.

'The life was manifested, and we have seen it, and, bear witness, and shew unto you that eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us.'—I JN II¹.

There are not a few men and women to-day who think of Christianity as something dull, sombre, devitalized. Nothing could be further from the impression made upon the mind by the records of its earliest and purest manifestation.

Consider the passage before us, written, we are told, by one near the extreme limit of human life. Yet what ringing conviction is here, and what a sense of the nearness and fullness of life as he adds hurried phrase to phrase to emphasize the reality of his experience.

Of speculation about life there had indeed been abundance in the world before this time. Ever since Socrates, the founder of Moral Philosophy, said that the unexamined life was not worth living for man, many of the finest minds of the Greek race had devoted themselves to examining life. For all mere argument about Life, the New Testament substitutes its witness to a fact. 'In him was Life'—that is the challenge which it throws out to the questioning spirit of man.

Life is something hidden, mysterious, always eluding us when we try to express its nature in words; yet it is familiar and well known in our living experience, and it has certain marks or signs which cannot be mistaken. Let us go over some of these marks, that we may understand

better how we actually know life and recognize its presence. And, as we do so, let us look towards the life of Jesus Christ, to see whether these marks were present there.

(1) First, we may name as characteristic of life its *Power in seeming weakness*. The Parable of the Mustard Seed is one of the simplest and most universal of arguments from the world of Nature to that of Spirit. And the contrast becomes still more striking when the seed falls, not on kindly soil but amid rough and hard surroundings which give it little apparent hope of a prosperous growth. 'I remember well,' says Mr. G. F. Barbour, 'as a boy, a seedling larch which had lodged in a fissure in the heart of a large boulder. At that time it was hardly taller than myself, but in less than twenty years it had grown to be a shapely, spreading tree, full forty feet in height; and the boulder which had harboured the seed lay round the root, broken into several portions.'

This is indeed the characteristic power of living things, that they can thrive in unexpected places, and overcome the apparently strong and fixed and immovable things of the world, because they have the capacity for expansion, for growth. This in turn depends on their power to draw sustenance from the most opposite elements that surround them. The sapling finds its nourishment not in beings like itself, but in the impalpable air and the unyielding rock; and in virtue of this power it not only can live among, but it can turn to the uses of its own development the various elements, hard as well as gentle, in which it has been placed.

Not less is this true in the spiritual sphere. Whenever we see the hard facts of life, as we naturally call them, yielding before the steady, silent pressure of a hidden force which is able to draw strength from adversity and overcome evil by good, we recognize the working—mysterious but unmistakable—of spiritual life. This working of life has been seen in the characters of the brave and quiet men and women of every century, but never so clearly as in that of Jesus.

(2) Again, life is marked by *Originality*. Its forms cannot be predicted even by the most careful and exact scientific thought. It is said that the formation of crystals bears some resemblance to the beginnings of life; but, even if this is true, the contrast is far more striking. For all crystals, however delicate their beauty and however great the variety of their forms, conform to geometrical patterns. But life is independent of geometry. It is indeed true that every healthy living thing shows its nature in the general habit of its growth.

¹ W. E. Orchard, *No More War*, 49.

An acorn develops into an oak, not into any other tree. But, while every plant or animal is determined in its development by the type to which it belongs, yet there is nothing monotonous in the forms to which they finally attain. Each has its own differences. As life becomes more free, more perfect, more itself, it reaches a greater variety of form, until even in the natural world, but still more in the spiritual, each living thing is characteristic and unique, or, as St. Paul says, 'a new creation.'

This great law of the operation of the life-force can be readily verified from our own experience. We are always apt to be imitative even in our efforts after good. But we also know that this arises, not from fullness, but from lack of life. If we were completely alive, our best actions would be the most free from rote or rule, the most natural, spontaneous, and varied.

So, beyond all question, it was with Jesus. Let us think of His dealing with individuals—Peter, the Centurion, Simon the Pharisee, Zacchæus, the women who sought Him in distress, the children who come for a moment upon the scene. At every point there is originality, freedom from convention, an entire concentration upon, and adaptation of word and action to, the need of the person with whom Jesus was in contact at the moment—that person and no other. No man can predict the form to which a living thing will grow, nor could any predict the least word or action of the Master; but no sooner was it spoken or performed than it was recognized to be the right word, the one entirely fitting action.

(3) Third, we may name *Self-dependence and the Power to awaken Life in others*. The living organism does indeed borrow such nourishment as it needs from the surrounding world, but the central flame of life burns on, never for a moment extinguished, and in due time kindling other flames like its own. For biology the individual life is never wholly isolated, but always points beyond itself and finds its completion in the creation of other lives. If this be true, then the most perfect life will be that which has the greatest power of kindling life in others, and giving it free play where it has been smothered or obscured.

Here once more we find life at its highest and most potent in Jesus. On the one hand we see its self-dependence, which for Him meant dependence on His Father—on whom, among His disciples or friends, could He depend in the times of greatest stress? He 'trod the winepress alone.' It was given to Him 'to have life in Himself,' but never for Himself. Let us go through the story of His ministry again—noting in thought the continually

self-giving character of His life, and seeing how the smoking flax of one crushed or hopeless or sin-steeped heart after another lightened into living flame at His touch.

(4) From power, amid weakness and self-dependence, we pass to a last characteristic of life—*Persistence*, or the power to endure. This becomes in the moral sphere *Perseverance*, the unquenchable energy, the unbreakable resolve to go on to the day's end. This is the last and most searching test of vitality—does it wear out? The supreme life must be one that endures to the very end. We know how the life of Jesus satisfies this test. No enmity, no disappointment, no danger, could turn Him from His course.

So the great question meets us. Is this the last word about life, that it perseveres to the end, that it is too strong to be turned from its course by all the forces of the world, but that it ends in absolute self-surrender?

But the history of the Life of Jesus does not end with the Cross. Those who had been closest to Him reached the firm assurance—not then, indeed, but afterwards—that His life had not so ended life. He became to them the Lord of Life, who had a life-giving power, greater even than that which He had exercised while He walked and taught and healed in the flesh. And the evidence for this strange and daring belief was supplied by their new experience and by their own transformed lives.

Yet all this took place nineteen centuries ago. Has it any message, any sure consolation for those who have looked forth on a world dominated not by life, but by death? Whenever in these past centuries men have returned to that source of life of which we have been thinking, they have found it flowing still; and all the conflicts which have brought such immeasurable sorrow on the world and have fastened upon it the rule of death, have been due to their neglect of the life which was manifested in Jesus Christ. For that life, if it were given free passage through every region of human activity, would bring us back to brotherhood and peace.¹

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Religion, an Art or an Action.

'And, lo, thou art unto them as a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument: for they hear thy words, but they do them not.'—Ezk 33³².

It is one of the discoveries men have to make for themselves, that beauty and goodness are not

¹ G. F. Barbour, *Addresses in a Highland Chapel*, 57.

necessarily bound up in the same bundle. This had at least been brought home to the prophet. There were in his constituency men of good taste who liked to hear the word of the Lord delivered in pleasant fashion, but there was none of that improvement of conduct which the prophet, being something more than a public entertainer, desired to see among his people.

The subject is one of the oldest in the world. Once more there is staged the conflict between beauty and truth, art and morals. And since men have been able to think about the relations between things, they have found themselves perplexed and irritated by the difficulty of reconciling these two. The view of the artist is common to his tribe. He stands for the things that are lovely. The standpoint of the teacher, the moralist, is different. He is bent on selecting things, dividing them one from the other, not by their beauty or ugliness, but by some quality which has to do with intention, purpose, and conduct.

Consider, then, the artist's point of view. For him there is only one standard of comparison. He wants to know if a thing is pleasing, does it create emotions of delight in the beholder or hearer? If so, then it is good.

Look at the pictures of Raphael: There the instinct for form, pure and lovely, seems carried to its highest range. Remember, however, that the artist cared little for the piety of the characters he represented in such exquisite contours. Think of that period in which so much of pure loveliness was given to the world. We see the story of the time in the life of Cellini, who can rightly claim some of the finest artistic work of his day, who made one statue recognized as a masterpiece, but who was by his own confession an unprincipled villain who set at defiance the maxims of the moralists and sages. Or think of our own poet Swinburne. He seems to have been born with an incapacity to understand any moral appeal, and sets himself in opposition to every doctrine which would demand allegiance to law, or reverence for accepted codes of right.

If we could all agree that the only thing to do in this world is to enjoy whatever is pleasing, there would be no further discussion. But then we immediately come up against certain ideas, convictions, held by many intelligent men, cherished by not a few of the great artists, which seem to challenge any such interpretation. For these men say plainly that beauty by itself is not enough.

Look at the work of some of these men and the difference is discernible at once. They seem to be

seeking for something more difficult to attain than that desired by the pure artist, the man who is a lover of beauty and nothing else. Michael Angelo hammers his rough stone, paints these wild figures of the Sistine Chapel, but plainly he is wrestling not merely to produce beautiful forms, but to use the medium of stone or colour to set forth ideas about good and evil, to preach to the ages, in fact, according to his own theories of what men should believe, of how they should act. So strong is this grasp of the moral element upon him that he will even use ugliness as his servant, making figures which are revolting to taste, that he may impress his message on the mind. Or think of Dante, whose passion for loveliness of form was as keen as has ever been given to men, and yet the whole of his work is governed by an enthralling desire to advocate certain views about life, to proclaim ideas about good and evil. Ruskin as a writer, so concerned for his message that he comes to hate his own trick of fine writing, because men read him for the beauty of his language rather than to appreciate and understand his ideas. And all these men say, in one way or another, that the work of the artist is only of value when it is filled with solid meaning, has purpose, and moral purpose at that, running through every bit of it.

With all this the prophet will entirely agree. He is with them. But the prophet must go further. He is not content with awakening the nobler feelings. He would urge and persuade, and by force of argument and allurements of words would compel men to the actual performance of good deeds.

It has been urged with some reason that the Reformed Churches are too insistent in this demand for conduct. Conduct is not three-fourths of life, whatever Arnold may have thought. It is a part of life over which the soul can only have a limited control, it is dependent on external conditions far more than we think; it is shaped by the growing consciousness, social and communal, of the race, and is perhaps as much a matter of fashion as of ethics, if we rightly interpret it. And the task of the religious teacher is, not to change conduct but to create those emotions which will lead the human soul into happy relations with the infinite. Now there is an element of truth in that. A great Frenchman has made one of his characters say plainly enough that the only way to attain sainthood is to sin much and often. The more men sin the more certain they are to become saints. There is truth even in that caricature of the truth. But are we wrong in transferring the emphasis from emotion to conduct? At least it was the prophet's

way. And was it not that of the Master Himself? Which of these was his neighbour? asks Jesus. And the answer is one founded on right conduct.

Indeed, this has been the mark of prophetic preaching in all times. Glancing over the writings of Calvin or Knox, what is the chief impression left on the mind? Is it that they were verbal artists seeking to please the ear of an accomplished audience? Is it not rather that they are men engaged in the effort to find a way of conduct and to enforce, with every form of argument and appeal, the claims of that way on their readers? And the reforming spirit within the ancient church reveals itself in the same fashion. Savonarola was a mighty mover of the human heart, as those days in the Duomo show plainly enough, but the end of his preaching is seen when the Florentines come to throw their jewels and trinkets on the common bonfire as a sign that they have subdued their love of beauty to the claims of the spiritual life. And if we think of the men who in recent times have stamped the impress of their names on this business of preaching—of Chalmers, wrestling like one possessed of a demon with his great argument; of Irving pouring prophetic contempt on the idols of his generation; of Parker calling down the vengeance of God on a murderous potentate; of Spurgeon, lashing the sins of his time; or of Beecher, swinging himself and all his pulpit powers into the movement against slavery, challenging Virginia

planters and Liverpool merchants alike on the high grounds of Christian morality—we shall realize that prophetic preaching is something more than the manufacture of paragraphs pleasing delicate ladies or bored business men.

What, then, is the conclusion of this age-long debate? Which is the more important, the lovely words, the pleasant voice, or the commanding utterance which appeals to the intellect, sharpens the conscience, drives men to duty? Let us admit that neither is sufficient by itself. If we cut ourselves off from that world of loveliness which lies all around, how barren becomes even our worship, how naked and cold the sanctuary of God. If we live only for the things that titillate the senses, expect to be amused and pleased, but are careless about being warned, provoked, challenged as to our conduct in life, all the finest things in religion seem to fall from us.

Surely the great task of our time, for those of us who are interested in religion, must be the combination of these two. The æsthetic impulse must be satisfied. And the prophetic passion must have its way. Preaching and teaching must again have their end in the creation of the devout life, the development of right ideas concerning human relations, the enforcement of principles of conduct, the observance of which can be seen and known by the plain man.¹

¹ A. C. Hill, in *The Scottish Pulpit*, 105.

The Call of Saul of Tarsus.

BY THE REVEREND FRED C. ANDERSON, M.A., TARBOLTON.

SAUL was 'an Hebrew of the Hebrews.' The Hebrews, by the good pleasure and purpose of God, were the race of mankind specially fitted to be the hearers and speakers of the Word of God. They were characterized by a unique genius for religion. And the men of Israel who were its characteristic and representative expression were the prophets. The Israelites regarded their God as a God who communicated His will and purpose to such as had 'an eye to see, and an ear to hear.' The prophet was essentially a man who had such an eye and such an ear. The prophet saw and discerned the purpose of Jehovah running through the history of His people, and declared the mind of God concerning the tendencies of his own day. The prophet, being such a seer and hearer, stood between the God of

Israel and the men of Israel. As Dr. A. B. Davidson says: 'The prophet is a man of God, a servant of Jehovah, a messenger of God, a seer of the things of God, a speaker of the things of God to men.' The prophets were the flower of the nation—its best and greatest intelligence, its very marrow of moral character, its deepest and truest intuition, its poetry, its music, and its patriotism. In a word, the prophetic character was Israel's spirit and mind and soul and heart. He interpreted the 'idea' of Israel. Saul of Tarsus was nothing if he was not one of the greatest of the prophets—he was 'an Hebrew of the Hebrews.'

Saul, then, was essentially of the order and build and fullest stature of the prophets. His was a spirit and mind and soul and heart fitted to receive the Word of the Lord, just as was the spirit of

Moses, Elijah, Amos, and Isaiah. Saul was 'a chosen vessel' unto the Lord (Ac 9¹⁵), just as Jeremiah had been. Was not Jeremiah convinced that he was born for a special purpose, that he was God's prophet begotten by God from the beginning?—'Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee, and I gave thee a prophet to the nations.' And was not Saul identically persuaded as to his origin and destiny?—'It pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb, and called me by his grace, to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the nations?'

If it is true that *poeta nascitur, non fit*, even truer is it that *propheta nascitur, non fit*. At some stage in his life the spirit of the prophet experienced a crisis. This crisis involved his 'call.' Thus we have the call or crisis of Abraham in Gn 12¹⁻³, and a notable second call in Gn 22¹¹: the call of Jacob in Gn 28¹⁰⁻¹⁵, and a second in Gn 32²⁴⁻³⁰: the call of Moses in Ex 3¹⁻⁶: the call of Joshua in Jos 5¹³⁻¹⁵: the call of Samuel in 1 S 3¹⁻¹⁴: the call of Isaiah in Is 6: the call of Jeremiah in Jer 1⁵⁻¹⁰: the call of Ezekiel in Ezk 1²⁸⁻²¹⁻⁵: the call of Amos in Am 7^{14, 15}: in the New Testament we have the record of many calls (disciples, and others); but above all others, we read there (Mt 3¹³⁻¹⁷, Mk 1⁹⁻¹¹, Lk 3^{21, 22}) of the call of Jesus at the Baptism of John. If we studiously and sympathetically compare these and other calls, both in the Old Testament and the New, we are struck not only with their resemblance, but with their essential identity. Consider also the call of Saul of Tarsus in especial, alongside of the calls of Moses, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Jesus Christ; and we cannot but observe manifold identity. In all these calls, in whatsoever way we interpret the bright light brighter than the sun's, the voice which speaks, and the other recorded phenomena we witness the subject of the Theophany or Shechinah being supremely aware that God is present to him, that God has truth to communicate to him, that God commands him to undertake His work and to speak out His mind and purpose to and for men.

The supreme reality of a 'call' was Jehovah's self-communication to the man who was of such spirit and nature as to be able adequately to receive Him. Saul, being highly of the prophetic order and build, is called or apprehended by *Jehovah*, just as he came within sight of Damascus. It was Jehovah who called Abraham: it was Jehovah who called Moses: it was Jehovah who called Isaiah: it was Jehovah who called Jesus: it was Jehovah who called Saul of Tarsus. The shining of the light

from heaven was the same experience for Saul as the bush that burned with fire and was not consumed was for Moses, and the smoke that filled the Temple and the lighted coals were for Isaiah. He became supremely aware that the God of Israel was signally laying His hand upon him, that Jehovah was to commission him, that he was a chosen vessel to speak Jehovah's Word and to do special work for Him. Is not Saul's falling to the ground paralleled by Moses' hiding of his face, and Isaiah's woe-stricken cry, and Ezekiel's falling upon his face? Moses hears the voice: Isaiah hears the voice: Ezekiel hears the voice: Jesus hears the voice: Saul hears the voice. Further, Daniel alone heard the voice, but the men that were with him heard not the voice: there were many in the Temple, but Isaiah alone heard the voice: Ezekiel was among the captives by the river Chebar, but Ezekiel alone heard the voice; John Baptist and a multitude were with Jesus at His baptism, but Jesus alone heard the voice: the men that were with Saul saw the light, but heard not the voice (Ac 22⁹). Yet again Saul is twice-named: and in the Scriptures Abraham (Gn 22²), Jacob (Gn 32²⁸), Moses (Ex 3⁴), Samuel (1 S 3¹⁰), are prophets twice-named at the hour of their call. In the New Testament Peter (Mt 16^{17, 18}) is twice-named, and significantly is twice-named at the hour when he makes the great testimony at Cæsarea-Philippi, and is, as it were, called or converted anew. Saul, then, is of the select inner circle of the twice-called. Enough, surely, has been said to show that Saul was called in the same way, by the same experience as were his greatest fellow-prophets.

Yet, though the calls of the prophets have deep fundamentals in common, the call of each has its own distinctiveness. In all it is Jehovah who reveals Himself, but Jehovah reveals Himself in different forms and names, and the word and commission He delivers vary with the individuality of the prophet and the circumstances of the particular hour in history. To Abraham the voice is that of the LORD, or El-Shaddai, or the angel of the LORD: to Moses the voice is the voice of the Angel of the LORD, or I AM THAT I AM: to Isaiah the voice is that of THE HOLY ONE OF ISRAEL. To Saul the voice is the voice of Jesus. Jehovah, Israel's God, says to Saul that He is Jesus. Saul's call, like the calls of his fellow-prophets, consisted essentially in his knowing Jehovah at first-hand in personal fellowship, or in Jehovah's making Himself known immediately to His prophet. And to Saul Jehovah gives Himself the specific name of JESUS OF NAZARETH.

Again, Saul's call has this peculiarity. Jehovah, before naming Himself, speaks sorrowfully, indignantly, mercifully, and remonstrates with the prophet whom He now calls to office. 'Why persecutest thou Me?' The soul of Saul was struggling in all the agony of the wrestling Jacob; and with most painful desire, like Jacob, he must know the name of his adversary. Saul's soul was excruciatingly divided within and against itself. With one-half of all his being he went one way: with the other half of his being he went another way. He, like John and James (Lk 9⁵⁴), knew not what manner of spirit he was of. Part of the man expected Jehovah, in this hour of His revealing, to speak in some such terms as these: 'I am the Lord God of Israel, and I am come to go before and with you in your defence of My name.' The complaint preferred against one part of his divided, furious soul was so much in conflict with that part's expectation, that, sore perplexed 'twixt belief and unbelief, he can only ask the confused question, 'Who art thou, Jehovah?' Saul knew he was confronted immediately with Jehovah. Yet, instead of Jehovah appearing in character, He appears out of character. Then it was that the subconscious suppressed belief of Saul was set free to declare itself. 'I, Jehovah, am Jesus.' Saul's soul had been torn and rent, he had been like a beast wounded and furious with pain. The division of his soul consisted in his attempt to harbour at one and the same time opposite and irreconcilable convictions: *i.e.* (1) Jesus is anathema; (2) Jesus is Jehovah or LORD.

This Theophany or Shechinah gave Saul the true knowledge of Jehovah, the God of Israel. Jehovah, the form of God known to Israel, took at last, after progressive revelation, the form of man. Jehovah became Jesus of Nazareth (Ph 2⁵⁻¹¹). All truth was involved in the truth brought home to Saul in that hour of the crisis of his life: the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Resurrection were here given.

Saul saw now, with the seeing power of the most highly privileged prophet, that Jehovah, in His loving-kindness for sinful dying men, had become a man in order that, as man, yet without sin though experiencing all its assaults, He might bear the sins of men in His own body, and, having triumphed over sin and death, should rise from the grave, and, exalted at the right hand of God, should save men from sin and should raise in resurrection with Him them that should have faith in Him.

The prophet was born again, was born from above, in the hour of his call. God became the one and final reality. God was the only power. The purpose of God was the only purpose which could occupy the prophet's powers, and the work of God became the prophet's only task and hope. All this, and more than all this, was true of Saul in that Damascus-road crisis and ever afterwards. The perception of the truth about Jesus recreated and reinvigorated all his theological and ethical outlook and trend. God, as now experienced and known, possessed Saul as the consuming inextinguishable passion of his life.

In brief summary, our endeavour here has been to show that (1) Saul of Tarsus was essentially and primarily of the order of the prophets—Saul was one of the very greatest prophets.

(2) His call was, in essence, the normal call of the true prophet.

(3) The Word, the Message, the Truth which he received and must preach to all nations is 'JESUS is LORD,' *i.e.* Jehovah became Jesus.

(4) The interpretation of the call of Saul is identical with and analogous to the interpretation of the prophets Abraham, Moses, Samuel, Isaiah, Ezekiel. In all these calls the subjectivity or objectivity of the phenomena is similar and necessitates similar explanation, and

(5) The theology, the ethic, and all the life and labour of Paul are organically involved in and related to his call.

Contributions and Comments.

Marginal Notes on Driver-Gray's 'Job (J.C.C.).

INTRODUCTION.

Page xlv. In last line of § 26 for עָלוּ read עָלוּ.
 „ lxxiv. Last line but 2, for G (LXX) read D (Hebrew).

PART I.

- Page 38. First line of comment, to the references to RGZ add 35²⁴.
 „ 45. To note on 13^a add ref. ('cf.') to 1 K 18²¹.
 „ 54. Note on 13^a,—'the only passage'? No. Cf. 13^b with Ph 1¹⁰ and the note to 41¹¹. On the numerous resemblances Dhorme

(*Livre de Iob*) has a good note, page cxxxix.

- Page 57. To note on 23 add ref. (for 'elves') to 31³⁹, where see note (p. 272) on 'elves.'
63. Comment, line 5, for loosing read losing.
123. To note on 16 add ref. to Ph 1¹⁹—LXX exactly quoted.
162. Translation of 20 transpose east and west
198. Translation of 23, 'tents.' The singular in B^k etc.: as in LXX.
305. Translation of 8^b for wickedness read righteousness.
359. Comment, line 7 read hippopotamus.

PART II.

- Page 10. Note on 22 'give.' Add ref. to 36³.
14. Note on 10, NQBL. For inf. read Hif. Ptc.
17. Note on 4. *Dele* 17¹⁸ (no ga'ya there?).
17. " 5 G'L. Cf. also G'L 'abhor.'
20. Note on 17, first line, y.
22. Note on 25. In the third G-K ref. for t read f.
25. Note on 17. Add ref. to 35².
36. Note on 6. For 1²⁷ read 1²².
41. Note on בחמו. For יהם read יהם.
49. Note on 6. To refs. for ZKK add 9³⁰.
50. Note on 7 last line. For ש read ש.
62. line 1. For QÔT read QÛT and ct. QÔT in 8¹⁴.
64. Note on 15. In the quotation from La for ש read ש.
75. Note on 4. In the text of Du. *dele* the dot over yod in yihyeh.
77. Note on 6. To 'only here' add 'ct. 38³⁶.'
85. Note on 17. To 32⁶ add 10. 17 and omit those verses after 36.

Page 90. Note on 10. Add the Sin point in Way'hallêš.

91. Note on 11, ולי. For 32²⁶ read 32³⁶.
105. Note on 9. For 2³ (2 K 9) read 3³.
105. " 11. For 'children' read 'child.'
108. Note on 20 DLPH. In ש read ש for ז.
111. Note on 2 TLN. In last word for final kaph read nûn.
121. Note on 20, last line. For Sin read Sin.
123. Note on 15. To G-K ref. add 60 a.
131. Line 3 add šin point.
145. Note on 6, 'ז is subj.' Ct. translation, p. 183.
157. The † refers only to absolute. Cf. BDB and 26²⁹.
160. Note on 6. Add ref. to G-K 100¹ for dgh. in ז.
164. Note on 2, yassîgû. In G-K ref. for 75 read 72.
174. Note on 24, line 3. For (G-K ref.) 69 read 67.
188. Note on 21, ש as in some texts. Is not ש (cf. BDB) preferable? See G-K 64 d.
200. Line 3. Add ref. to 1¹⁰.
- Note on 8, line 1. Add ref. to 12¹² and note on p. 77.
209. Line 11. Has 'wrack and ruin' been suggested for the alliteration here?
211. Note on 10. For (Is) 51 read 50.
242. Line 5. Read 73 a.
247. Note on 21, Ru'û. For the dgh. in נ (in some MSS) see G-K 14 d.
248. Line 2, 'do not occur elsewhere' (Du.). Cf., however, 2 K 17²⁶, Je 26¹⁵.
255. Line 2. For 13 read 14.
302. Note on 13. Transpose the two middle letters in the word from ש.

H. F. B. COMPSTON.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

Archbishop Benson.

Mr. E. F. Benson, third son of the Archbishop of Canterbury of that name, and the author of a little library of books beginning with 'Dodo,' has now published a volume of 'Memories' with the title *As We Were: A Victorian Peep-Show* (Long-

mans; 18s. net). Archbishop Benson, who could trace his ancestors over a period of five hundred years, was the first of the family to attain a position of eminence. He was the first bishop of Truro, and from that infant diocese was translated by Mr. Gladstone, with the full approval of Queen Victoria,

to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Thus with no experience of the House of Lords he became the chief of the bench of bishops in that chamber of the Legislature, and his wife and young family exchanged the obscurity of far-away Truro for the fierce light that beats upon the historic Lambeth Palace. Under the title of 'Two Sisters,' Mr. Benson gives a revealing narrative of the aristocracy of that time—the early 'seventies. The better known of the two sisters became Lady Henry Somerset, who so shocked the opinion of the upper circles of the time by obtaining a decree of separation from her husband that she had to retire from the world of her upbringing and her marriage which would no longer receive her. We are told that 'fire and brimstone rained down upon Lady Henry,' but she accepted her fate, and Mr. Benson shows with what heroism and success she set to work to redeem from the scourge of intemperance members of her own sex. This is but a bald summary of Mr. Benson's frank and candid narrative of the career of a notable woman who rose superior over an implacable boycott.

It is a familiar story now that Queen Victoria and Mr. Gladstone did not see eye to eye on many questions. Mr. Benson writes that 'though her majesty maintained an impeccable impartiality in politics and would never attempt to resist the will of her people, she was a thorough Tory at heart, and regarded him as an enemy to Church and State, and thus an enemy to the throne. . . . It was therefore with the most unfeigned pleasure that she saw the fall of his last ministry in 1894, and she commented on it privately to my father with remarkable frankness. . . . "Mr. Gladstone has gone out, disappeared all in a moment," she gleefully observed. "His last two ministries have been failures, indeed his last three."'

Mr. Benson insists that Queen Victoria was a woman of 'peerless common sense'; 'her common sense amounted to genius'; 'common sense poured out from her, grey and strong, like the waters of the Amazon.' And yet Mr. Gladstone was not the only one of her Prime Ministers with whom she had serious differences. The history of her long reign is full of them, from the time of Sir Robert Peel to the time of Lord Salisbury. She had as many differences with the latter on the exercise of his ecclesiastical patronage as she had political differences with Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Benson's peep-show includes a great variety of personages notable in their day, but it is to be regretted that he has thought it necessary to retell at great length the sordid story of the Tranby Croft affair

with which the then Prince of Wales—afterwards King Edward VII.—was involved, and the still more odious story of Oscar Wilde, long since buried in oblivion.

An Archbishop's Love Story.

In the volume of 'Memories of E. F. Benson,' third son of Archbishop Benson, he tells at full length what he calls 'the little Victorian love story' of his father and mother, with 'its adorable heroine of twelve years old.' The future Archbishop, who had taken a brilliant degree at Cambridge and won the Classical blue ribbon of the year, the Chancellor's gold medal, given by the Prince Consort, was in the habit of spending the recess with his widowed cousin, Mrs. Sidgwick, the mother of three brilliant sons and a daughter eleven years old. The student of twenty-three was always very fond of the clever child of eleven and she of him, with the love of a little sister. This is a record from the young man's diary:

'MINNIE: Edward, how long will it be before I am as tall as if I was standing on that stool?

EDWARD: I don't know very well, Minnie, five years perhaps. . . .

MINNIE: When I am twenty I shall be taller than that?

EDWARD: Yes.

MINNIE: When I am twenty, how old shall you be?

EDWARD: Thirty-two.

MINNIE: Thirty-two! Edward, I shan't look so little compared to you, shall I, when I'm twenty and you're thirty-two, as I do now that I'm eleven and you're twenty-three?

EDWARD: No, no, you won't, Minnie.

This unexpected close made me blush indeed, and the palms of my hands grew very hot.'

The sequel is also told in the diary: 'And so at last the day came and I spoke to her (a little fair girl of twelve seated on his knee) and asked her if she thought it would ever come to pass that we should be married. . . . I told her that it was often in my thoughts, and that I believed that I should never love anyone so much as I should love her if she grew up as it seemed likely. . . . She made no attempt to promise, and said nothing silly or childish, but affected me very much by quietly laying the ends of my handkerchief together and tying them in a knot, and quietly putting them into my hand.' When the little fair girl of twelve had become a girl of seventeen young Benson was appointed the first headmaster of Wellington College, and they were married. 'From that time

onwards she was the staff on which he leaned, and the wings that gave him flight.'¹

Religious Scruples.

There is a striking story of how the future Archbishop of Canterbury showed himself as a young man willing to make a great sacrifice for what he considered the truth. His widowed mother by an unfortunate investment of her money was left almost penniless. But a wealthy bachelor uncle offered to adopt one of her younger sons as his son and heir. He was a Unitarian, and the future Archbishop at once offered strong objection. 'Nothing was further from his uncle's intention than to attempt to influence the child with regard to religion, and my father was solemnly assured of that, but he still saw danger in committing his brother to a Unitarian household, and remained firm.' He undertook at once all the responsibility for the education and upbringing of his younger brother as a member of the Church of England. The sequel was a remarkable instance of providential aid in the hour of need. 'There came forward a man who had no connexion with the family, but who instantly begged to be allowed to take upon himself the whole of my father's expenses at Cambridge, and all future maintenance till he was earning an adequate income for himself and for the support of his brothers and sisters. This was a middle-aged bachelor don and bursar of Trinity College, Mr. Francis Martin, who had a romantic and devoted affection for him.'²

A Constructive Ministry.

Some little time ago Dr. Boreham delivered an address to ministers at Fifth Avenue, New York, on the need for a constructive ministry, and he has now included this in his new volume, *The Blue Flame* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). The volume contains twenty-four other addresses in Dr. Boreham's best manner. Dr. Boreham has a place all his own, for no one has more stories to tell, and no one can tell them in a better way. It is impossible for the reader's attention to flag.

The text of the address on the need for a constructive ministry consists of a single word, 'add.' 'Add,' says Peter, "add to your faith, virtue; and add to your virtue, knowledge; and add to knowledge, temperance."

When the water supply of Jericho became tainted it was cleansed by salt being poured into it by Elisha. 'Away under the Southern Cross I know

of a city that attempted to beautify itself by the construction of an artificial river. The winding channel was dug through the city and connected with an abundant supply of water. And the citizens rejoiced in the new loveliness of their city. But very soon a troublesome waterweed appeared in the bed of the stream. It flourished to such an extent that the little river became choked; no canoe or pleasure boat could pass up or down its surface. And the people were troubled. Every device was employed to hack out the roots of the weeds, and all kinds of chemicals were employed in the attempt to eradicate them. But to no purpose. Then one day some genius made a new suggestion. "Leave the weeds alone," he said, "and plant willows along the banks of the river!" The scheme was tried. And lo, the roots of the willows devoured the substances on which the weeds had been luxuriating; the weeds died away of their own accord; and the drooping and graceful willows now impart a fresh loveliness to the stream. It is always by a principle of addition that we solve our spiritual problems. I attempt to tear out of my soul the besetting sins that plague me, and I find it a tedious business. But if I can plant a few fresh graces in this soul of mine, it may be that, as those lovely growths prosper, the vices that molest me may gradually vanish of their own accord. I may destroy the weeds by planting willows.'

It is by the same principle of addition that ministers make their contribution to the national life. Let me commend to your consideration the story of John Keble, says Dr. Boreham. And he retells it—how Keble, the most distinguished student of his day, retired from Oxford and buried himself as his father's curate at Fairford in Gloucestershire. 'It seems to him, as he strolls across these golden cornfields and saunters down these leafy lanes, that the people of England are steeped in the lethargy of a deadly indifference whilst the Church is engrossed in fierce and bitter controversies. What can he do to mend matters? . . . As he crossed and recrossed the village green at Fairford, and moved up and down those country roads, he meditated on the themes of the Church's calendar, the themes that would demand his attention on the coming Sunday. A born poet, his thoughts struggled to express themselves in verse, and, as soon as he reached the parsonage, he pencilled down the poems that had imparted an added delight to his walk. The manuscripts grew in number until he had a poem for every day of the Church's year. His friends got to hear of them and pressed him to publish. In 1823 he showed

¹ E. F. Benson, *As We Were*, 62.

² *Ibid.* 57.

them to Dr. Arnold, afterwards the famous headmaster of Rugby. "It is my firm opinion," said Arnold, "that nothing equal to these poems exists in our language. The wonderful knowledge of Scripture that they exhibit, I never saw paralleled." . . . He decided to publish, anonymously, the verses that all the world now knows as *The Christian Year*. And, beyond the shadow of a doubt, the publication of *The Christian Year* did more to cleanse and sweeten the life of England than any negative criticism could have done.'

Nor must ministers forget that it is their supreme business in life to *add* to the membership of Christ's Church. Dr. Boreham gets his story this time from a book on mountaineering by Edward Whymper. Mr. Whymper engaged a dwarf, Luc Meynet, as handy man to do the rough-and-tumble work of his expeditions. 'All through the years of his mountaineering career, little Luc was his devoted servant and most faithful friend.

'Mr. Whymper decided to take him to the top. He could go as tent-bearer. Luc was radiant. They set out, and the little man was so eager not to be a burden to the expedition that he would eat only the crusts that the others threw away, and would drink only the grounds of the coffee. They had to help him here and there, but they got him to the top.

'And Mr. Whymper adds that he regards as one of the greatest moments of his mountaineering career the moment when he came around a great boulder on the summit and saw little Luc. He was on his knees. "It was inconceivable," says Mr. Whymper, "that we had ever considered his face ugly. It was positively radiant with the transports that filled his soul." His hands were thrown up in admiration, perhaps in adoration, and he was exclaiming, "Oh, beautiful, beautiful mountains—oh, beautiful, beautiful mountains!" Mr. Whymper always felt that, in beholding Luc's ecstasy at that supreme moment, his career as a mountaineer had reached its climax and its crown.'

'The joy of joys, the rapture of raptures, the ecstasy of ecstasies, the triumph of triumphs, is not in standing *yourself* upon the mount of God with sunlight in your soul; but in standing there and looking around on *others* who, but for you,

could never have reached those lofty altitudes at all.'

The Black Christ.

We welcome the fourth volume of poems by Countee Cullen, the negro poet—*The Black Christ, and Other Poems* (Putnam; 5s. net). It is natural that the colour question should be the underlying motive of Mr. Cullen's work, and we quote as example of this a lyric with the title 'Black Majesty,' which was suggested after reading John W. Vandercook's 'Chronicle of Sable Glory.'

These men were kings, albeit they were black,
Christophe and Dessalines and L'Ouverture;
Their majesty has made me turn my back
Upon a plaint I once shaped to endure.
These men were black, I say, but they were
crowned
And purple-clad, however brief their time.
Stifle your agony; let grief be drowned;
We know joy had a day once and a clime.

Dark gutter-snipe, black sprawler-in-the-mud,
A thing men did a man may do again.
What answer filters through your sluggish blood
To these dark ghosts who knew so bright a reign?
'Lo, I am dark, but comely,' Sheba sings.
'And we were black,' three shades reply, 'but
kings.'

The long poem which gives the title to the volume has the same motive. It is the tale of a negro lad who is lynched by white men. After his death he appears again in living form before his mother and brother, and they recognize him as the Christ. That he died without a fair trial is clear, but that there was anything vicarious in his death does not appear.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.